This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Photo by Harris and Ewing

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE WOMAN CITIZEN'S LIBRARY

A Systematic Course of Reading in Preparation for the Larger Citizenship

Editor

SHAILER MATHEWS, D.D.

Dean Divinity School, The University of Chicago
President, Western Economic Society

TWELVE VOLUMES··FULLY ILLUSTRATED

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE CIVICS SOCIETY

CHICAGO

1913-14

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
665091
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1914 L

COPYRIGHT 1913 BY
THE CIVICS SOCIETY

VOLUME II

Political Science

By JESSE MACY, M.A., LL.D.
Professor of Political Science, Iowa College
Author of several standard works

EDITOR'S NOTE

The purpose of THE WOMAN CITIZEN'S LIBRARY is to fit women for the Larger Citizenship and naturally such preparation should begin with the study of Political Science. This Course by Dr. Macy, is undoubtedly the best popular presentation of the fundamental principles of the "Science of State" ever published and should be read carefully.

Following this department will come the departments of "Practical Politics," "Woman Suffrage," "Woman and the Law," "Woman and the Larger Citizenship," etc., all arranged in their logical order. (See list of subjects and contributors for full outline.)

Particular attention is called to the practical and convenient arrangement of the text. Information on important subjects is supplemented by quotations from other authorities. All such quotations are given in full thus doing away with the necessity for extensive research. (Copr., MDCCCXCVIII., by T. U. A.)

VOLUME II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART V

PAGE

Democracy in the New World 277

Democracy Not a Mere Form of Government. Chapter I. 277

Democracy Not Based Upon Force. Chapter II..... 289

Force as Related to Slavery and War. Chapter III.... 297

Force Supplemented by Superstition. Chapter IV..... 306

Education is Involved in Every Kind of Government. Chapter V 314

Force Supplemented by Falsehood. Chapter VI..... 325

Questions for Review. Part V..... 334

Subjects for Special Study..... 336

PART VI

Hindrances to Democracy 337

New Wine in Old Bottles. Chapter I..... 337

"The Tyranny of Majorities." Chapter II..... 349

The "Laissez Faire" Theory of Government. Chapter III 359

Man Versus The State. Chapter IV..... 368

The State and The Government. Chapter V..... 380

Voluntary Association. Chapter VI..... 391

Questions for Review. Part VI..... 399

Subjects for Special Study..... 400

PART VII

PAGE

Education in the Democratic State 402
The Spartan State. Chapter I 402
The Athenians. Chapter II 412
The Hebrews. Chapter III 423
The New Education. Chapter IV 435
The Triumph of Science. Chapter V 444
The Safety of Democracy. Chapter VI 454
Questions for Review. Part VII 462
Subjects for Special Study 466

PART VIII

Coöperation in the Democratic State 467
Coöperative Education. Chapter I 467
Public Sanitation. Chapter II 476
Sanitation (Continued). Chapter III 486
The State and Voluntary Associations. Chapter IV 493
Industrial Monopolies. Chapter V 502
Conflict Between Despotism and Coöperation. Chapter VI 510
Questions for Review. Part VIII 517
Subjects for Special Study 518

VOLUME II

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

FRONTISPIECE The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. 268

Parliament Building, Athens, Greece 281

Imperial Parliament Buildings, Vienna, Austria 299

A Woman of North China 317

View from the City Wall, Pekin, China 327

A Group of Japanese Women 345

Houses of Parliament, Wellington, New Zealand 355

Houses of Parliament, Melbourne, Australia 373

Houses of Parliament, The Hague, Holland 389

Sparta, Greece, from the Therapne 407

Constitution Square, Athens, Greece 417

Park Royale and Approach to Parliament Buildings, Brussels, Belgium 427

Hall of Ambassadors, Royal Palace, Madrid, Spain 445

The Mikado's Palace, Tokio, Japan 463

The National Palace, City of Mexico, Mexico 481

Government Palace, Tokio, Japan 499

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For those who wish to read more extensively, the following works are especially recommended:

Author — *Title of Work*

John W. Burgess ..... Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law
Henry Sumner Maine ..... Popular Government
Henry Sumner Maine ..... Ancient Law
Rudolf Eucken ..... Problem of Human Life
Woodrow Wilson ..... The State
Thomas Hill Green ..... Political Obligations
Shailer Mathews ..... The French Revolution
Walter Bagehot ..... Physics and Politics
Edward Westermarck ..... The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas
Samuel Rawson Gardiner ..... History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate
I. T. Prichard and David Nasmith ..... Ortolan's History of Roman Law
John P. Jones ..... India: Its Life and Thought
Robert Filmer ..... Patriarcha, or The Natural Power of Kings
James Wilford Garner ..... Introduction to Political Science
D. G. Ritchie ..... Principles of State Interference
Thomas Hobbes ..... Leviathan
Wm. Dwight P. Bliss ..... Encyclopedia of Social Reform
Westel Woodbury Willoughby ..... The Nature of the State
Arthur Twining Hadley ..... Freedom and Responsibility in the Evolution of Democratic Government
Arthur Twining Hadley ..... Economics
Jean Jaques Rousseau ..... Le Contrat Social
John Locke ..... Treatises on Government
George Grote ..... History of Greece
John Richard Green ..... A Short History of the English People
Henry Thomas Buckle ..... History of Civilization in England
Paul Leicester Ford ..... Works of Thomas Jefferson
Aristotle (Morley's Universal Library) ..... Ethics and Politics
Friedrich W. A. Froebel ..... The Education of Man
David Starr Jordan ..... The Care and Culture of Men
Henry Demarest Lloyd ..... Wealth Against Commonwealth

Political Science

PART V

Democracy in the New World

CHAPTER I

DEMOCRACY NOT A MERE FORM OF GOVERNMENT

ASIA, Mr. Burgess says, has produced no State,[1] while it has produced all the great religions of the world. This is true if we define a State as a body politic, whose policy is determined by public opinion. If, however, we include among the States of history large bodies of people in a given locality, subject to the rule of emperors and kings through long series of years, then no part of the world has been so successful in the creation of States. There were the great States of Nineveh, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Parthia, the many dominions in India, while the Chinese Empire could boast of a continuous existence transcending that of all other States. Yet if the political philosopher takes as his model the modern democratic State, and so limits his definition of a State, then he is obliged to say that the Chinese Empire, now no more, was not a

State. It was something so different that it leads to confusion to try to put it in the same class. This is another way of illustrating the lesson that before discussing the nature of the State we must decide which kind of State it is. If Switzerland, England and America are types of the State, then China before the Revolution was an anti-State. The fundamental principles of the one so contradict those of the other that the western democrat may indeed say that until Japan and China established governments built on western models Asia produced no State of its kind.

7. But the modern State is new. Not earlier than the Stuart Century in England was the idea fully developed that the nation as a whole is the source of authority and that the rulers were subordinate agents of the nation. And not until the present century has there been consistent effort to put the idea into practice. Not until the time of the American and the French revolutions, did the conflict between the two contradictory theories of the State show a tendency to become international. England and America, pitted against the Holy Alliance, furnishes the best illustration of the issue as drawn between nations.

An electrical engineer has said that we cannot know what electricity will do for the world until a generation has been taught to think electricity from childhood. A hundred generations of our ancestors have been taught to think despotic government. History, philosophy, religion, literature, the very words we use,

have all been formed in harmony with the fact of the universal experience of despotism. Before a generation may grow up to think democracy from childhood there must be created a new history, philosophy, literature, a new statement of religion, a new nomenclature, or at least a new use of old words. We are one and all victims of thoughts, feelings and prejudices derived from past despotic ages. The maiden speech in the House of Commons is prefaced by a request for the indulgence of the House. He who attempts to write about modern democracy deserves likewise the indulgence of his audience because he labors under peculiar difficulties.

(2) One obvious difficulty arises from the fact that the chief terms, such as "Democracy" and "Republic," were in use before the advent of the fundamental conception of the modern democratic State. Sir Henry Maine has, perhaps, done as much as any man of our generation in the preparation of materials for the rewriting of history in harmony with modern democratic views. Yet among his latest works is a book on Popular Government, in which there is manifested a complete inability to follow other than the ancient lines of political reasoning. After stating explicitly that the new view of government has come into existence in recent times, he appears as a sort of "devil's advocate" against popular governments of all forms and all ages.[2] He takes no account of the admitted fact that the States of the West are in the act of

adopting an entirely new principle of government, but proceeds to confuse the modern democratic State, with the ancient Greek and Roman States which chanced to be designated by the words now in use.[3]

The Greek democracy was simply one form of government. The Greeks assumed that the masses of the people were born to perpetual servitude. They assumed that a citizen was a man who lived upon the labor of others. They taught explicitly, just as the Asiatic despot teaches, that the masses of men are by nature subject, that the few are by nature rulers.[4] Among the methods of exploiting the labors of the people, the Greeks recognized three distinct forms of organization. In one form the citizens recognized one as the head of the State, in another a select body, in a third a larger body was admitted to a share in the government. And this constituted the ancient classical division of governments into the three classes of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. As presented by the Greeks they were simply three forms of government; three ways of doing the same thing; three methods of exemplifying the one fundamental principle that the mass of human beings are by nature perpetual subjects, while the few only are born to rule.

Sir Henry Maine furnishes a sad exemplification of the fact that ancient forms of thought survive even in the mind of one who has clearly recognized new conditions which render them absurd. He clearly comprehends the modern assumption that all the

Capitols of the World
PARLIAMENT BUILDING, ATHENS, GREECE

people are equal before the law, that they have an equal share in choosing their rulers, that the rulers are accounted simply servants, and the great body, the people, are in the position of masters. Yet, seeing all this and using it to pour contempt upon popular government, he yet completely ignores the fact that it is new. I feel absolutely sure that if the conception of modern democracy could have been gotten into the heads of Plato and Aristotle both of them would have recognized something totally different from the democracy of their own day. These clear-headed philosophers would have perceived that the new Christian democracy represented a new and contradictory view of human nature. Sir Henry Maine defines democracy as "inverted monarchy."[5] He reasons that the two words stand for essentially the same thing, and that monarchy is its natural form, democracy being artificial and derived. Aristotle could possibly have understood this reasoning as applied to ancient democracy. But to call the modern Christian democracy simply an inverted monarchy, he would have regarded as inverted reason.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER I

Democracy Not a Mere Form of Government

[1] **The Origin of the State.**—Many were the centuries before the human mind became even partially conscious of the State in idea, character, and purpose. The State existed as a fact long before it was known and understood, and its powers were long exercised under forms which we do not now regard as political at all. If the theologian means, by his doctrine of the divine origin of the State, simply that the Creator of man implanted the substance of the State in the nature of man, the historian will surely be under no necessity to contradict him. The unbiased political historian will not only not dispute this proposition, but he will teach that the State was brought through the earlier and most difficult periods of its development by the power of religion, and in the forms of religion: *i.e.*, that the earliest forms of the State were theocratic.

This is entirely comprehensible from the standpoint of a correct political philosophy. The first and most fundamental psychological principle concerned in the development of the State is that of piety; *i.e.*, reverence and obedience. Unless the character of the mass of the population be moulded by this principle, the reign of law can never be attained.

Now the lifting of this principle from under the barbaric powers of hate and defiance was the first tremendous struggle of civilization with barbarism. It took thousands of years to accomplish it, and exhausted the spiritual powers of all Asia in its accomplishment. I have already indicated the fact that *Asia has produced no real States. Asia has, on the other hand, produced all the great religions of the world.*

This will not be held to mean, however, that Asia has done

nothing toward the historical development of the State, when we consider that her religions have educated and disciplined the larger part of the human race in that preparatory spiritual principle absolutely indispensable to the development of the State. It is often said by modern writers that Asia is but the home of theocracies and despotisms. This is undoubtedly true, but it should not be taught in the language of depreciation.—*"Political Science and Constitutional Law," by John W. Burgess, Vol. I, pp. 59, 60.*

Prospects of Popular Government.—Two different views may be taken (says Sir James Stephen) of the relation between rulers and their subjects. If the ruler is regarded as the superior of the subject, as being by the nature of his position presumably wise and good, the rightful ruler and guide of the whole population, it must necessarily follow that it is wrong to censure him openly, and, even if he is mistaken, his mistakes should be pointed out with the utmost respect, and that, whether mistaken or not, no censure should be cast on him likely, or designed, to diminish his authority. If, on the other hand, the ruler is regarded as the agent and servant, and the subject as the wise and good master, who is obliged to delegate his power to the so-called ruler because, being a multitude, he cannot use it himself, it must be evident that this sentiment must be reversed. Every member of the public who censures the ruler for the time being, exercises in his own person the right which belongs to the whole of which he forms a part. He is finding fault with his own servant.

The States of Europe are now regulated by political institutions answering to the various stages of the transition from the old view, that "rulers are presumably wise and good, the rightful rulers and guides of the whole population," to the newer view, that "the ruler is the agent and servant, and the subject, the wise and good master, who is obliged to delegate his power to the so-called ruler because, being a multitude, he cannot use it himself." Russia and Turkey are the only European States which completely reject the theory that governments hold their powers by delegation from the community, the word "com-

munity" being somewhat vaguely understood, but tending more and more to mean at least the whole of the males at full age living within certain territorial limits.—*"Popular Government," by Henry Sumner Maine, pp. 7, 8.*

[3] **The Nature of Democracy.**—The enthusiasm for Democracy, which is conveyed by the figures of speech applied to it, is equally modern with the impression of its inevitableness. In reality, considering the brilliant stages in the history of a certain number of commonwealths with which Democracy has been associated, nothing is more remarkable than the small amount of respect for it professed by actual observers, who had the opportunity and the capacity for forming a judgment on it.

Mr. Grote did his best to explain away the poor opinion of the Athenian Democracy entertained by the philosophers who filled the schools of Athens; but the fact remains that the founders of political philosophy found themselves in the presence of Democracy, in its pristine vigor, and thought it a bad form of government. The panegyrics of which it is now the object are, again, of French origin. They come to us from the oratory and literature of the first French Revolution, which, however, soon exchanged glorification of the new birth of the human race for a strain of gloomy suspicion and homicidal denunciation.

The language of admiration which prevailed for a while had still remoter sources; and it may be observed as an odd circumstance that, while the Jacobins generally borrowed their phraseology from the legendary history of the early Roman Republic, the Girondins preferred resorting for metaphors to the literature which sprang from Rousseau.—*Ibid., pp. 74, 75.*

[4] **Plato's Ideal of State.**—Plato's latest view, which is contained in "The Laws," may here be disregarded, since, notwithstanding the wisdom of many individual utterances, it possesses too little completeness. On the other hand, the two views of the State which "The Republic" presents must be considered

In the first, we find Plato an energetic reformer of the Greek State, along the line of an enlargement of the Socratic doctrine The State is treated—with a sustained analogy to the human soul—as exhibiting the ideal of justice writ large. To this end,

all its affairs, and particularly education, should be regulated in strict accordance with the laws of ethics; the principal functions of society should be definitely distinguished, in conformity with the stages of soul life, and represented by the activity of fixed classes; each individual should perform his special task with whole-souled devotion, yet all should work together under the reign of intelligence toward one harmonious result. In order not to be drawn away from the service of the common end by private interests, the higher classes must relinquish private property and family ties; hence communism on ethical, not economic, grounds forms the copestone of the Platonic theory.

Thus the State becomes an ethical ideal, an empire of virtue based upon insight. Drawn in bold lines, this picture appears at first to present a sharp contrast to reality; closer inspection, however, reveals a number of threads of connection between the daring speculations of the thinker and actual Greek conditions. For at this time Plato still believed in the possibility of great reforms in the institutions of Greece.

The later sketch of the State surrenders this hope. The longing for the realm of immutable being has in the end so estranged the thinker from the conditions of human existence that he looks back upon life as he might upon a gloomy cavern seen from a lofty elevation. If, nevertheless, he returns thither, he does so, not to please himself, but for the sake of the brethren, and less in the hope of any result than in order even there to proclaim the eternal truths. The State which originates from this attitude is above all an institution for the preparation of men for the realm of eternal truth; here the task is, by an orderly ascent, gradually to free the soul from the sensuous, and win it over to the supersensuous; thus the whole of life becomes a stern education, a spiritual purification; and this education gradually raises man to a world in the presence of which all political life vanishes. By means of the State itself there results an emancipation from the sphere to which the State belongs.

Thus the two views are not only different, but incompatible. Yet, in spite of the disagreement, there are important features which are common to both, and which give to the Platonic State

a unity of character. In both, the State is man magnified; all authority rests with superior intelligence; spiritual and moral goods are the principal content of the life of the State; the individual is everywhere subordinated to the whole. Without an elimination of individual initiative and the establishment of irrevocable ordinances, the State cannot enter into the service of reason. But this permanence of conditions and strict subordination of the individual Plato demands at the same moment that he raises human personality high above the State, subjects traditional conditions to a searching criticism, and devises the boldest schemes for complete reconstruction. Accordingly, he demands for the philosopher a privilege which he denies to the rest of mankind: the State ought to receive a content free from all subjective opinion, yet it must receive it through the mental labor of the sovereign personality. This contradiction alone was sufficient to prevent Plato's doctrine from exercising the slightest contemporary influence; such valuable suggestions and fruitful seeds as it contained were forced to await for their appreciation entirely different conditions.—*"Problem of Human Life," by Rudolf Eucken, pp. 38-39.*

[5] **Democracy a Form of Government.**—Yet, although Democracy does signify something indeterminate, there is nothing vague about it. It is simply and solely a form of government. It is the government of the State by the Many, as opposed, according to the old Greek analysis, to its government by the Few, and to its government by One. The border between the Few and the Many, and, again, between the varieties of the Many, is necessarily indeterminate; but Democracy not the less remains a mere form of government; and, inasmuch as of these forms, the most definite and determinate is Monarchy—the government of the State by one person—Democracy is most accurately described as inverted Monarchy. And this description answers to the actual historical process by which the great modern Republics have been formed.—*Ibid., p. 59.*

CHAPTER II

DEMOCRACY NOT BASED UPON FORCE

THE contrast between the two contradictory classes of States cannot be understood without a knowledge of the relation of force to government. "*The authority of governors, directly or indirectly, rests in all cases ultimately on force. Government, in the last analysis, is organized force.*"[1] I give quotation marks in the use of these words, because, as a matter of fact, I have copied them from a book and the italics are a part of the quotation. Remove the italics and you have a form of words which any one may use without the least suspicion of plagiarism. The words express a view which forty centuries of experience have worked into the very texture of human thought. If these words express the last thing which is to be said about the nature of government, then democracy is simply inverted monarchy, and is doomed to failure.[2]

(1) Force is a term which comes into use in dealing with things which appear to have no life. We know of no way of doing anything with what we call lifeless matter except through the exercise of force. The same is true of plant life. We do not speak across lots to the plant: we mend its ways only through the con-

tinuous application of force. What is true of plants is equally true of the lower orders of animal life. We now know that many of our diseases arise from living organisms, and in dealing with them we meet force with force. But when we reach the higher orders of animals a new principle appears. The farmer takes a coat which has been politely rejected by a tramp and puts it on a pole in his garden. By this signal he does speak across lots to the crow. He mends the manners of the crow through a spiritual agency. That is, he perpetrates a fraud on the crow and utilizes the bird's power of conscious self-direction for the protection of his garden. But there are animals which are known in history as the companions and servants of man. Now as a matter of fact does man's control over domestic animals rest upon force, or does it rest upon something which is not force? I once looked out of my study window and saw a horse between two immense beams firmly attached to the front wheels of a wagon. Behind the wheels was a man in the position of driver. On either side of the horse was a stalwart man with a rope attached to the horse's mouth. The hind legs of the animal were attached to parts in front, and the front legs to the parts behind, with cords just long enough for the animal to take a normal step. If I had not known the animal I might naturally have reached the conclusion that horses were usually governed by force. But the particular horse was an abnormal product. Not one in ten thousand requires such

treatment. The chances are that the animal had been ruined in the training by an injudicious use of force. The horse is properly and normally governed, according as he is so trained as to dispense with the use of force. An animal which cannot be thus trained cannot be governed. It is a figurative use of the word when we speak of "governing" an engine, a river, or a wild animal. The domestic animal is an educated animal.

(2) In the proper use of the word, man does not govern wild animals. He deals with them for the most part purely on the basis of force, and this, properly speaking, is not government. As an incident to the changing of a wild animal to a tame animal force may be employed. But the government over the animal begins when the animal has been so trained that by the exercise of its own powers of conscious self-direction it does the things desired. Force is simply one agency in the process of training. Force may also be so used as to render the government of domestic animals impossible. Many farmers are poor because they persist in dealing with their domestic animals on the basis of force. The animals are thus made unruly, and do not fulfill their proper functions. Other farmers are rich because they have learned the secret of showing due respect to the proper nature of their animals. Those properly trained do by nature the things required.

(3) It may indeed be conceded that force is a necessary agency in the training of animals, and this

fact may lead to the assertion that as a matter of fact the government of brutes rests upon force. It would seem, however, more accurate to say that as a matter of fact such government rests upon training, that government begins at the point where force becomes unnecessary; that the success of the government is marked by the degree of the elimination of force, and the substitution of the power of conscious self-direction in the animal; that force is a mere neutral agency which may be employed either to render government impossible, or to promote the ends of government.[8] Force promotes the ends of government when it is so used as to lead to the substitution of something in the place of force.

The government of men has often been compared to that of brutes; and it has been assumed without any careful attention to the facts in the case, that brutes are governed by brute force. The forcible part of the process is impressive and is seen without effort. It is also closely associated with man's relation to other parts of the material world, which by common consent is a matter of force. Man makes for himself a place in nature by guiding and directing the forces of nature. All this creates a tendency to give to force a place in the dealing of man with man, which it does not deserve.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER II

Force in the Training of Animals

Government Rests Upon Authority and Force.—The essential characteristic of all government, whatever its form, is authority. There must in every instance be, on the one hand, governors, and, on the other, those who are governed. And the authority of governors, directly or indirectly, rests in all cases ultimately *on force*. Government, in its last analysis, is organized force. Not necessarily or usually organized armed force, but the will of one man, of many men, or of a community prepared by organization to realize its own purposes with reference to the common affairs of the community. Organized, that is, to rule, to dominate. The machinery of government necessary in such an organization consists of instrumentalities fitted to enforce in the conduct of the common affairs of a community the will of the sovereign man, the sovereign minority, or the sovereign majority.

Not Necessarily Upon Obvious Force.—This analysis of government, as consisting of authority resting on force, is not, however, to be interpreted too literally, too narrowly. The force behind authority must not be looked for as if it were always to be seen or were always being exercised. That there is authority lodged with rulers or magistrates is in every case evident enough, but that that authority rests upon force is not always a fact upon the surface, and is therefore in one sense not always practically significant. In the case of any particular government, the force upon which the authority of its officers rests, may never come, for governments together, take the shape of armed force. Happily there are in our own day many governments, and those among the most prominent, which seldom

coerce their subjects, seeming in their tranquil, noiseless operations to run themselves. They in a sense operate without the exercise of force. But there is force behind them none the less, because it never shows itself. The strongest birds flap their wings the least. There are just as powerful engines in the screw-propeller, for all she glides so noiselessly, as in the side-wheeler that churns and splashes her way through the water.

The better governments of our day — those which rest, not upon the armed strength of governors, but upon the free consent of the governed — are without open demonstration of force in their operations. They are founded upon constitutions and laws whose source and sanction are the will of the majority. The force which they embody is not the force of a dominant dynasty nor of a prevalent minority, but the force of an agreeing majority. And the overwhelming nature of this force is evident in the fact that the minority very seldom challenges its exercise. It is latent just because it is understood to be omnipotent. There is force behind the authority of the elected magistrate, no less than behind that of the usurping despot, a much greater force behind the President of the United States than behind the Czar of Russia. The difference lies in the *display* of coercive power. Physical force is the prop of both, though in the one it is the last, while in the other it is the first resort. —*"The State," by Woodrow Wilson, pp. 593, 594.*

[2] **Will, Not Force, is the Basis of the State.**—It is a mistake, then, to think of the State as an aggregation of individuals under a sovereign, equally so whether we suppose the individuals as such, or apart from what they derive from society, to possess natural rights, or suppose them to depend on the sovereign for the possession of rights.

A State presupposes other forms of community, with the rights that arise out of them, and only exists as sustaining, securing, and completing them. In order to make a State there must have been families of which the members recognized rights in each other (recognized in each other powers capable of direction by reference to a common good); there must further have

been intercourse between families, or between tribes that have grown out of families, of which each in the same sense recognized rights in the other.

The recognition of a right being very short of its definition, the admission of a right in each other by two parties, whether individuals, families, or tribes, being very different from agreement as to what the right consists in, what it is a right to do or acquire, the rights recognized need definition and reconciliation in a general law.—*"Political Obligations," by Thomas Hill Green, p. 139.*

[3] **Reign of Terror as Government by Force.**—When the Mountain, with the aid of the Paris Commune, finally, though without bloodshed, had suppressed the champions of Greek and Roman sentimentality, and was able to act as well as debate, it saw Holland, Portugal, the Two Sicilies, the Roman States, Sardinia and Piedmont, Spain, Austria, Prussia, England, united against France; French ports blockaded by the most powerful navy in the world; the departments rising to avenge the Girondins; the French armies everywhere defeated; Dumouriez, the greatest commander of the French armies, gone over to the enemy; a third of the territory of France, including Vendée and many great cities, in open and successful insurrection; the *assignats* rapidly depreciating; and throughout the nation misery, poverty, and approaching anarchy. No government was ever beset with greater or more desperate needs, and no government ever proceeded more relentlessly to bring success to its armies, order to its domestic affairs, food to its poor, annihilation to rebellion. But on what could government be based? Not on the constitutions, for millions of Frenchmen were in arms against constitutions; not on the past, for the Old Régime and the Constitutionalists of 1789-91 were the Mountain's bitterest opponents; not on the armies, for generals might at any moment imitate Dumouriez or La Fayette; not on the ready assent of law abiding citizens, for the *bourgeoisie* were enemies of the Jacobins. The question was as legitimate as pressing, and the Mountain's answer was, *Upon Terror.* If men would not obey government from

love, they must be made to obey from fear. The action was only a rigorous application of the dominant political philosophy of Rousseau; the sovereign people must be obeyed.

It is therefore a fundamental mistake to think of the Terror as a carnival of brute passion or the outcome of anarchic forces become ascendant. This was true of certain days, like October 5 and 6, 1789, and especially of the work of the Commune during the interregnum of August 10-September 20, 1792, and of the work of certain agents of the Convention, but utterly false in the case of the government by committees between June, 1793, and July, 1794. The Terrorists were seekers after order, not after anarchy, and while it lasted the Terror was a genuine experiment in politics — crude, hideous, and never to be confounded with the work of the generous idealists of the Constituent Assembly; but in a politically ignorant and morally weak nation like France, possessing not a single man of first-rate ability among its legislators, probably inevitable. It was all but foreseen by Mirabeau when he failed to induce the court to regard the work of the Constituent Assembly seriously and to accept its results sincerely. But more than all, it was implicit in the absolution and the morals of the Old Régime.—*"The French Revolution," by Shailer Mathews, pp. 225-227.*

CHAPTER III

FORCE AS RELATED TO SLAVERY AND WAR

IN former lessons we have seen that in the earliest forms of the primitive village state there was no division into the classes of rulers and subjects. The community was held together by primitive family ties, by coöperative labors in the management of land, by common customs and religious rites. With the advent of slavery there arose a class accustomed to command and a class accustomed to obey.

(1) It would be much easier to prove that the government of slaves rests upon force than that the government of domestic animals so rests. In any event human beings are not animals, and cannot be governed in the same way. Animals are dealt with as individuals. One is not chastised for the sake of an example to others. One brute cannot be taught to teach other brutes. But one slave is often punished for the sake of the effect on other slaves. One slave is taught to teach other slaves. Slaves are by nature governed socially. Animals cannot in the same sense be thus governed. To frighten and terrorize an animal makes it more ungovernable. Men are sometimes more easily governed when their faculties are paralyzed by

fear. There have been many instances in human history where governments have been maintained by sheer terror. In such a government, subjects fear the rulers, and the rulers fear their subjects. The one class maintains its ascendency by its superior ability in the arts of terrorizing. Such a government, it may be admitted, does rest upon force. One class rules because it is thought to possess superior force. A very large proportion of the human family has had an experience of slavery.[1] Slavery furnishes the first crude model for a human government which everybody can understand, and the thing about slavery which is most striking and easily understood is the fact of force. In actual slavery there was always much which was not force, but this is not so obvious, it is not so readily comprehended. Slavery, therefore, has been a teacher of despotic government, the teacher of government founded upon force.

(2) The one thing which distinguishes radically the government of human beings from the government of domestic animals is the fact of vicarious punishments. If there is wrong-doing on the part of a company of slaves it is a matter of comparative indifference as to which individual slave is punished. It is enough that one be punished in such a manner as to strike terror into the minds of all. As a mere economy of force, where the master, as well as the slave, lives in terror, he will select for punishment the less dangerous, or, at least, punishments will be administered without the

Capitols of the World

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, VIENNA, AUSTRIA

665091

slightest regard for justice. This principle is found in early society quite apart from the institution of slavery. If one family or tribe is injured by another, there is no demand that the individual culprit be punished. It is enough that some one of the offending tribe shall pay the penalty. In such a case, where tribe is pitted against tribe upon equal terms, there is some crude sense of justice as between tribes, but none as affecting individuals. But where rulers are placed over subjects on the basis of brute force there is no meeting on terms of equality. Victims for punishment will be selected from the standpoint of the safety of the rulers. It is a mere accident if the selections coincide with distributive justice.

Force, therefore, does hold a place in the government of human beings which it cannot hold in the government of animals. The limitations of the brute save it from vicarious punishments. The reasons for torturing the living and for mutilating the dead do not hold in the case of animals. The conduct of men may be controlled by forms of terror unknown to lower animals.

(3) In their origin, war and slavery are closely related. Captives in war became slaves. Both war and slavery tend to the development of a government in which force is a leading factor. It is assumed that there was a time when our village ancestors labored together in the raising of crops, and without permanent leaders went forth to defend their crops against

marauders. Neighbors stood side by side in the host as they were accustomed to labor side by side in the fields. But serious and protracted war created permanent leaders and commanders. He who got himself obeyed in wars that extended over months and years, got himself obeyed also during the brief intermissions of war. Thus war led to the creation of a distinct class of persons who were accustomed to give commands to freemen. The very nature of war requires implicit obedience on the part of the soldier. War *is* organized force. It aims at the destruction of all men and all things which thwart the purpose of the commander.

They who engage in war are usually freemen. They usually approve of the object of the enterprise, and for the sake of the common object they render willing obedience to the commander. The slave, on the other hand, is usually regarded as one who is driven through fear of punishment to the performance of unwilling tasks.[2] But freemen who have learned to govern slaves, become themselves subject to the commands of others in matters of warfare and in the preparation for war. The soldier and the slave are alike in this: each becomes accustomed to receive and to obey commands from a recognized superior.

(4) War and slavery involve forms of government to which the great body of the race have been subject for thousands of years. They represent methods of control most simple and most easily comprehended. If

the soldier disobeys the commands of his officers he is slain. If the slave is disobedient he is tortured. The facts are in themselves impressive. They have burned themselves into the human brain in such a way as to make it difficult or impossible to think of any other method of governing, or any other basis for government than that of sheer brute force. The very name slave, suggests the lash; the very thought of military discipline brings up a picture of summary punishment. Napoleon found a soldier with light in his tent contrary to orders. He was informed that the disobedience was for the sake of writing a letter to friends. He ordered the soldier to add the news that he would be shot in the morning for disobeying orders. Such a government requires no explanation. Yet in the actual relation of slave and master there is much besides the lash. There is much of kindness and friendship; there is much of mutual concession and forbearance; much of intelligent self-interest. So in the relation of general and soldier there is much besides the court martial; and these other things are vastly more important to the correct understanding of the business. Yet to understand these other things requires laborious thought, while to understand the application of force requires no thinking.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER III

Force as Related to Slavery and War

[1] **State Superiority.**—Another mode in which one State acquires a superiority over competing States is by *provisional* institutions, if I may so call them. The most important of these — slavery — arises out of the same early conquest as the mixture of races. A slave is an unassimilated, an undigested atom; something which is in the body politic, but yet is hardly part of it. Slavery, too, has a bad name in the later world, and very justly. We connect it with gangs in chains, with laws which keep men ignorant, with laws that hinder families. But the evils which we have endured from slavery in recent ages must not blind us to, or make us forget, the great services that slavery rendered in early ages. There is a wonderful presumption in its favor, it is one of the institutions which, at a certain stage of growth, all nations in all countries choose and cleave to. . . . "There are very many English colonies," said Edward Gibbon Wakefield, as late as 1848, "who would keep slaves at once if we would let them," and he was speaking not only of old colonies trained in slavery, and raised upon the products of it, but likewise of new colonies started by freemen, and which ought, one would think, to wish to contain freemen only. But Wakefield knew what he was saying; he was a careful observer of rough societies, and he had watched the minds of men in them. He had seen that *leisure* is the great need of early societies, and slaves only can give men leisure. All freemen in new countries must be pretty equal; every one has labor, and every one has land; capital, at least in agricultural countries (for pastoral countries are very different), is of little use; it cannot hire labor; the laborers go and work for themselves.

There is a story often told of a great English capitalist who went out to Australia with a shipload of laborers and a carriage; his plan was that the laborers should build a house for him, and that he would keep his carriage, just as in England. But (so the story goes) he had to try to live in his carriage, for his laborers left him, and went away to work for themselves.—*Bagehot's "Physics and Politics," International Scientific Series, New York, 1879, pp. 71-73.*

[2] **Slavery Rights.**—Slavery is essentially an industrial institution, which implies compulsory labor beyond the limits of family relations. The master has a right to avail himself of the working power of his slave, without previous agreement on the part of the latter. This I take to be the essence of slavery; but connected with such a right there are others which hardly admit of a strict definition, or which belong to the master in some cases, though not in all. He is entitled to claim obedience and to enforce this claim with more or less severity, but his authority is not necessarily absolute, and the restrictions imposed on it are not everywhere the same. According to a common definition of slavery, the slave is the property of his master, but this definition is hardly accurate. It is true that even in the case of inanimate property the notion of ownership does not involve that the owner of a thing is always entitled to do with it whatever he likes; a person may own a thing and yet be prohibited by law from destroying it. But it seems that the owner's right over his property, even when not absolute, is at all events exclusive, that is, that nobody but the owner has a right to the disposal of it. Now the master's right of disposing of his slave is not necessarily exclusive; custom or law may grant the latter a certain amount of liberty, and in such a case his condition differs essentially from that of a piece of property. The chief characteristic of slavery is the compulsory nature of the slave's relation to his master. . . . If slavery proper could be based upon a contract between the parties concerned, I fail to see how to distinguish between a servant and a slave.—*"The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas," by Edward Westermarck, Vol. I, pp. 670-671.*

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER III

Force as Related to Slavery and War

[1] **State Superiority.**—Another mode in which one State acquires a superiority over competing States is by *provisional* institutions, if I may so call them. The most important of these — slavery — arises out of the same early conquest as the mixture of races. A slave is an unassimilated, an undigested atom; something which is in the body politic, but yet is hardly part of it. Slavery, too, has a bad name in the later world, and very justly. We connect it with gangs in chains, with laws which keep men ignorant, with laws that hinder families. But the evils which we have endured from slavery in recent ages must not blind us to, or make us forget, the great services that slavery rendered in early ages. There is a wonderful presumption in its favor, it is one of the institutions which, at a certain stage of growth, all nations in all countries choose and cleave to. . . . "There are very many English colonies," said Edward Gibbon Wakefield, as late as 1848, "who would keep slaves at once if we would let them," and he was speaking not only of old colonies trained in slavery, and raised upon the products of it, but likewise of new colonies started by freemen, and which ought, one would think, to wish to contain freemen only. But Wakefield knew what he was saying; he was a careful observer of rough societies, and he had watched the minds of men in them. He had seen that *leisure* is the great need of early societies, and slaves only can give men leisure. All freemen in new countries must be pretty equal; every one has labor, and every one has land; capital, at least in agricultural countries (for pastoral countries are very different), is of little use; it cannot hire labor; the laborers go and work for themselves.

There is a story often told of a great English capitalist who went out to Australia with a shipload of laborers and a carriage; his plan was that the laborers should build a house for him, and that he would keep his carriage, just as in England. But (so the story goes) he had to try to live in his carriage, for his laborers left him, and went away to work for themselves.—*Bagehot's "Physics and Politics," International Scientific Series, New York, 1879, pp. 71-73*

[2] **Slavery Rights.**—Slavery is essentially an industrial institution, which implies compulsory labor beyond the limits of family relations. The master has a right to avail himself of the working power of his slave, without previous agreement on the part of the latter. This I take to be the essence of slavery; but connected with such a right there are others which hardly admit of a strict definition, or which belong to the master in some cases, though not in all. He is entitled to claim obedience and to enforce this claim with more or less severity, but his authority is not necessarily absolute, and the restrictions imposed on it are not everywhere the same. According to a common definition of slavery, the slave is the property of his master, but this definition is hardly accurate. It is true that even in the case of inanimate property the notion of ownership does not involve that the owner of a thing is always entitled to do with it whatever he likes; a person may own a thing and yet be prohibited by law from destroying it. But it seems that the owner's right over his property, even when not absolute, is at all events exclusive, that is, that nobody but the owner has a right to the disposal of it. Now the master's right of disposing of his slave is not necessarily exclusive, custom or law may grant the latter a certain amount of liberty, and in such a case his condition differs essentially from that of a piece of property. The chief characteristic of slavery is the compulsory nature of the slave's relation to his master. . . . If slavery proper could be based upon a contract between the parties concerned, I fail to see how to distinguish between a servant and a slave. "*The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*," *by Edward Westermarck, Vol. I, pp. 270-271.*

[3]

CHAPTER IV

FORCE SUPPLEMENTED BY SUPERSTITION

AS old as war or slavery, are religion and superstition. As early as there was a distinct warrior class there was usually a distinct class who dealt in the occult arts. It is probable that the importance of mere brute force in every sort of government has been overestimated, because it is so easily understood. The power which one class of men gains over another through a belief in supernatural agents is vastly more important. The fear of offending the gods is much more effective in controlling the conduct of men than is the fear of any punishment which men may inflict.[1] In all cases where there is a prolonged and successful subjection of the many to the few, the few secure the support of religious conviction. Their subjects look upon them as persons of peculiar sanctity, as beings surrounded and protected by divine powers, as beings in a way fulfilling the wishes of the gods.[2]

(1) Government through superstition is quite in harmony with the methods of governing by brute force, because in each case the appeal is to fear or terror; in each case the victim is controlled by a paralysis of reason. Superstition is more effective than force,

because it may be used to forestall the development of reason. The mind of the subject is victimized from the beginning, and is made subject to continuous and pervasive terrors.

(2) We have now considered the three sorts of training which are the chief factors in the formation of the despotic, or the Asiatic state, namely, the training under slavery, under the discipline of war, and under a distinct priestly class. It must be admitted that force plays an important part in all these methods of governing. Yet even in such governments there is much that is not force. If a master has only one slave, he may by extraordinary brutality keep the higher faculties of his slave in a state of paralysis and thus reduce him to something like a brute. But only an abnormal master will do such a thing. If there are two or more slaves, the difficulty in enforcing such a government is greatly increased. An extensive institution of slavery can only exist where the higher faculties are called into play in the minds of both master and slave; where there comes to be recognized a binding moral code; where both master and slave realize that there is an exchange of mutual services; where there is a sense of friendly coöperation. If Simon Legree were the type of all masters, the institution of which he was a part could never have existed. The success of the institution is explained by the relation of "Uncle Tom" to his first master.

(3) In some of its earlier forms, war may be under-

stood as simply one method of friendly coöperation for the common good. Friends and neighbors labored together to produce the crops raised on lands held in common, and stood shoulder to shoulder in their defense. In any event, effective war involves the hearty coöperation of the fighting body. A general who fails to win the confidence and in a sense the approval of his men does not win battles. In Asia and Egypt, British soldiers have sometimes confronted soldiers who were driven into battle under the lash. This is another instance in support of the proposition that the Asiatic state represents a principle absolutely contradictory to that of a Western state. An army of slaves is no army at all. It is a disgrace to a Western soldier to be required to shoot at such men. To say that the discipline or government of Western armies is simply organized force, is to exhibit the shallowest sort of thinking and observation. It is rather organized voluntary coöperation to a common end. The summary punishment of the delinquent is a punishment demanded by the body of the soldiers, and it receives their approval. Any other sort of punishment tends to weaken and to destroy the army. It is much nearer the truth to say that an army is organized friendly coöperation. Clearchus conquered his rebellious army by his tears. To see the iron man weep, broke the hearts of the Greeks and they determined to follow him into the deserts of Asia, though they knew he had lied to them and deceived them. They could not desert

a man in trouble. Whatever this may be called, it is *not organized force.*

The case, however, is very different where an army is set to rule a state. Such a government is described with tolerable accuracy by calling it *organized force.* The army is simply a killing machine. Its entire discipline and training tends to make it unfit for anything else. The education of a soldier tends to unfit him for either giving or receiving good advice. A soldier has no business with mere private opinions and private judgments. An army must act as if every man believed the same thing. It is no place for the play of opinions. The soldier who is only a soldier has a contempt for a man with opinions. An army with a vacillating opinion or a divided counsel which is allowed to result in divided conduct, is a weakened or a ruined army. An army, therefore, which attempts to rule a state must use the only sort of power which it has. That is, its superior killing power. This is the fact of primary importance in accounting for the peculiar type of the despotic state. A distinct ruling class gains control of the most effective killing power, and uses it in such a manner as to effectively forestall the development of public opinion. A military democracy is a contradiction in terms.[8] A democracy must rest upon public opinion. But the purely military despotism has ever been a short-lived government. It carries within itself the seeds of self-destruction and rapid disintegration. The Asiatic state adds to the military despotism,

the training of all the people to the acceptance of religious teachings. The military despot, unsupported by a distinct priestly class, which succeeds in enslaving the minds of the people, is soon destroyed. The Asiatic state is organized superstition, supported by force. If it may be said to rest upon force, it is because the teaching of superstition cannot be successfully maintained without the use of force.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER IV

Force Supplemented by Superstition

[1] **Early Society.**—At first sight it seems impossible to imagine what conceivable function such awful religions can perform in the economy of the world. And no one can fully explain them. But one use they assuredly had: they fixed the yoke of custom thoroughly on mankind. They were the prime agents of the era. They put upon a fixed law a sanction so fearful that no one could dream of not conforming to it.

No one will ever comprehend the arrested civilization unless he sees the strict dilemma of early society. Either men had no law at all, and lived in confused tribes, hardly hanging together, or they had to obtain a fixed law by processes of incredible difficulty. Those who surmounted that difficulty soon destroyed all those that lay in their way who did not. And then they themselves were caught in their own yoke. The customary discipline, which could only be imposed on any early men by terrible sanctions, continued with those sanctions, and killed out of the whole society the propensities to variation which are the principle of progress.—*Bagehot's "Physics and Politics," pp. 56, 57.*

[2] **Superstition as an Aid to Government.**—Among many peoples the task of government has been greatly facilitated by a superstition that the governors belong to a superior order of beings and possess certain supernatural or magical powers to which the governed can make no claim and can offer no resistance. Thus Dr. Codrington tells us that among the Melanesians "the power of chiefs has hitherto rested upon the belief in their supernatural power derived from the spirits or ghosts with which they had intercourse. As this belief has failed, in the Banks'

Islands, for example, some time ago, the position of a chief has tended to become obscure; and as this belief is now generally undermined a new kind of chief must needs arise, unless a time of anarchy is to begin."

* * * * * * * *

Similarly Mr. Basil Thomson tells us that "just as every act in a Fijian's life was controlled by his fear of Unseen Powers, so was his conception of human authority based upon religion." The dead chief was supposed still to watch jealously over his people and to punish them with dearth, storms and floods, if they failed to bring their offerings to his tomb and to propitiate his spirit. "The first blow at the power of the chiefs was struck unconsciously by the missionaries. Neither they nor the chiefs themselves realized how closely the government of the Fijians was bound up with their religion. No sooner had a missionary gained a foothold in a chief village than the tabu was doomed, and on the tabu depended half the people's reverence for rank. The tabu died hard, as such institutions should do. The first fruits were still presented to the chief, but they were no longer carried from him to the temple, since their excuse — as an offering to persuade the ancestors to grant abundant increase — had passed away. No longer supported by the priests, the sacred chief fell upon evil days"; for in Fiji, as in other places, the priest and the chief, when they were not one and the same person, had played into each other's hands, both knowing that neither could stand firm without the aid of the other.—*"Psyche's Task," by J. G. Fraser, pp. 4-5.*

[3] **The Commonwealth and Its Enemies.**—The execution of Charles I.—the work of military violence cloaked in the merest tatters of legality — had displayed to the eyes of the world the forgotten truth that kings, as well as subjects, must bear the consequences of their errors and misdeeds. More than this the actors in the great tragedy failed to accomplish, and, it may fairly be added, must necessarily have failed to accomplish.

It is never possible for men of the sword to rear the temple of recovered freedom, and the small minority in Parliament which had given the semblance of constitutional procedure to

the trial in Westminster Hall were no more than instruments in the hands of the men of the sword.

Honestly, as both military and political leaders desired to establish popular government, they found themselves in a vicious circle from which there was no escape.—"*History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*," *by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, Vol. I, pp. 1, 2.*

CHAPTER V

EDUCATION IS INVOLVED IN EVERY KIND OF GOVERNMENT

IN all forms and methods of governing thus far discussed there is one element in common. Whatever be the form, the governing is through training and education. Man may exert some sort of control over the forces of nature, over plants, and over the lower order of animal life, but this is not government. It is directing the forces of nature. Domestic animals are governed in so far as they are educated to use their own powers of conscious self-direction in such a manner as to fulfill the wishes of men. Acts of brutality in a master result in governing a slave only as the slave learns to render propitiatory conduct. An army governs the multitude only as the multitude learns to avoid summary destruction by propitiatory conduct, while priests avowedly govern only as they educate and train the people. Even in the Oriental State, therefore, governing is by means of education.[1] And surely in a Western democracy education holds a no less prominent place. There is, however, this radical difference between the sort of education demanded in the two sorts of States. In the one, education involves repression, and in the last analysis rests upon

force; in the other, education involves the recognition of native faculties and their development through friendly coöperation.

(1) The two sorts of education rest upon contradictory views of human nature.[8] According to one view, human nature is such that there can be no peace and order in the State only when the masses are taught to render willing obedience to the commands of their natural superiors. It involves the conviction that the few are born to rule and the many are born to serve. According to the other view there will not be peace and order, until the State is organized on the basis of mutual exchange of services. It involves the conviction that human nature is violated so long as one human being feels himself the master of another human being. Man may rule over domestic animals and be at peace. But the attempt to treat a human being in the same way involves endless war.

(2) If the first view be correct, then education must be directed to the one end of securing obedience. Education in its very nature must be repressive. The mind must be forced along lines of activity which it would not otherwise pursue. The Koran is not a book which the natural man reads with interest. It is not especially adapted to awaken independent thought. Yet in its way it has had a remarkable success as an instrument of government. It has been forced upon many and diverse peoples at the point of the sword. But its great success is a text for the education of

rulers and subjects. The Turkish youth was forced to read the Koran at a time when the words can have little meaning. This would be dreary enough even if he read in a language which he understood. But he was forced to read in a foreign tongue. Now, if the end of education is obedience to commands which the recipient is not permitted to question, this is not only a proper but an essential method in education. An education which awakens thought and arouses intelligence is dangerous to the State. The great success of the Chinese Empire was due to a similar system of education. The mind of the Chinese youth was forced along the same lines that the minds of his ancestors pursued two thousand years ago. There was no room for question or inquiry. Infinite detail was imposed upon the mind, of matter which has no earthly relation to any intelligible thing, save the one all-important end of the preservation of the Empire, based as it was upon brute force and the worship of ancestors. When Western thought entered China the Empire was doomed.

(3) Governments in Europe have approached the Asiatic type according as they have adopted Asiatic methods in education. Education involved as a necessary consequence its appropriate methods in government. The rulers were correct in their conclusion that to permit the subject to teach unauthorized novelties about the shape of the earth, or about the meaning of

A WOMAN OF NORTH CHINA

a passage of scripture involved a fundamental change in Church and State.

The discovery of America, the circumnavigation of the globe, the invention of printing, the diffusion of knowledge and the habit of independent investigation, all tended to render the Asiatic State impossible in Europe and to put in its place the new Christian democracy. So long as China actually succeeded in walling out the light and intelligence of the West from the Empire, the Empire could endure. But with the breaking down of this wall, with the advent of new light and new methods in teaching, disintegration began; and the Chinese Republic came.

When Commodore Perry made his way into the Japanese Empire, the Japanese officials wished to know the rank of a certain American officer in order to administer proper punishment to one of their subjects who had insulted him. The interpreter named the ranks below that of the officer to the private soldier, and the ranks above to the President, and in reply to the question, "Who is above the President?" he answered, "The People." The Japanese officers studied over this a long time, and could make nothing of it. The Japanese nation is still studying that problem, and they are now making a great deal out of it. They are creating a Western State. The Oriental State cannot endure where there is a spirit of investigation diffused among the people. If the people are

to be governed by force they must be educated by force. They must be prevented from using their own minds in their own way. They must be forced to use them as directed by the rulers. Education by force means government by force. Education which encourages the free exercise of the mind means government by something other than force.[3]

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER V

Education is Involved in Every Kind of Government

[1] **The People of Israel.**—If ever a people has demonstrated the power of education, it is the people of Israel. In fact, what a singular spectacle is offered us by that people, which, dispossessed of its own country for eighteen hundred years, has been dispersed among the nations without losing its identity, and has maintained its existence without a country, without a government, and without a ruler, preserving with perennial energy its habits, its manners, and its faith! Without losing sight of the part of that extraordinary vitality of the Jewish people, which is due to the natural endowments of the race, its tenacity of temperament, and its wonderful activity of intelligence, it is just to attribute another part of it to the social education, at once religious and national, which the ancient Hebrews have transmitted by tradition to their descendants. "*The History of Pedagogy*," by Gabriel Compayré, p. 6.

[2] **Education Among the Nations.**—Speaking generally, the education of the primitive nations of the East had the following characteristics:

1. It was administered by the hieratic class. This was due to the fact that the priests were the only men of learning, and consequently the only men who could teach.

2. The knowledge communicated was in the main religious, ethical, and prudential, and the final purpose of instruction was good conduct.

3. As a matter of instruction was knowledge bearing the sanction of authority, the learner was debarred from free inquiry, and the general tendency was toward immobility.

4. As the knowledge of the day was embodied in language,

the process of learning consisted in the interpretation of speech, and so involved a large and constant use of the memory; and this literal memorizing of the principles and rules of conduct promoted stability of character.

5. As the purpose of instruction was guidance, there was no appearance of the conception that one main purpose of education is discipline or culture.

6. The conception of education as a means of national regeneration had a distinct appearance among the Jews; and among this people we find one form of compulsion — the obligation placed on towns to support schools.

7. In Persia, the State appears for the first time as a distinct agency in promoting education.

8. In China, from time immemorial, scholarship has been made the condition for obtaining places in the civil service, and in consequence education has been made subordinate to examinations.

9. Save to a limited extent among the Jews, woman was debarred from the privileges of education.

10. In the main, education was administered so as to perpetuate class distinctions. There was no appearance of the conception that education is a universal right and a universal good.

* * * * * * * *

Descartes has stated some of the great principles of modern pedagogy. The first is the equal aptitude of minds to know and comprehend. "Good sense," says Descartes, "is the thing of all else in this world that is most equally distributed. . . . The latent ability to judge well, to distinguish the true from the false, is naturally equal among all men." What is this but saying that all men are entitled to instruction? In a certain sense, what are the innumerable primary schools scattered over the civilized globe but the application and the living commentary of Descartes' ideas on the equal distribution of good sense and reason among men?

* * * * * * * *

Another Cartesian principle is the substitution of free inquiry and reflective conviction for blind beliefs founded upon author-

ity. Descartes promulgated this famous rule of his method: "The first precept is, never to receive anything for true that I do not know, upon evidence, to be such; . . . and to comprise no more within my judgments than what is presented so clearly and distinctly to my mind that I have no occasion to call it in question." In this declaration he has not only reformed science and revolutionized philosophy, but has banished from the school the old routine, the mechanical processes and exercises of pure memory, and has made a demand for rational methods that excite the intelligence, awaken clear and distinct ideas, and provoke judgment and reflection. Of course, it is not proposed to make a little Descartes out of every child, despoiling him of received beliefs in order to construct personal opinions *de novo;* but the rule of evidence, applied with moderation and discretion, is none the less an excellent pedagogical precept, which will never be disallowed by those who wish to make of the child something more than a mere machine.—*Ibid., pp. 190, 191.*

[8] **Responsibility of Civilization.**—There is no human right to the status of barbarism. The civilized States have a claim upon the uncivilized populations, as well as a duty towards them, and that claim is that they shall become civilized; and if they cannot accomplish their own civilization, then must they submit to the powers that can do it for them.

* * * * * * * *

The civilized State should, of course, exercise patience and forbearance toward the barbaric populations, and exhaust every means of influence and of force to reduce them to subjection to its jurisdiction before adopting this policy of expulsion; but it should not be troubled in its conscience about the morality of this policy when it becomes manifestly necessary. It violates thereby no rights of these populations which are not petty and trifling, in comparison with its transcendent right and duty to establish political and legal order everywhere.

There is a great deal of weak sentimentality abroad in the world concerning this subject. So far as it has any intellectual basis, it springs out of a misconception of the origin of rights

to territory, and a lack of discrimination in regard to the capacities of races. It is not always kept in mind that there can be no dominion over territory or property in land apart from State organization,—that the State is the source of all titles to land and of all powers over it. The fact that a politically unorganized population roves through a wilderness, or camps within it, does not create rights, either public or private, which a civilized State, pursuing its great world-mission, is under any obligations, legal or moral, to respect. It would be a petty morality, indeed, which would preserve a territory capable of sustaining millions of civilized men for the hunting-ground of a few thousand savages, or make its occupation depend upon contract and sale with and by them.

No one can question that it is in the interest of the world's civilization that law and order, and the true liberty consistent therewith shall reign everywhere upon the globe. A permanent inability on the part of any State or semi-State to secure this status is a threat to civilization everywhere. Both for the sake of the half-barbarous State and in the interest of the world, a State or States, endowed with the capacity for political organization, may righteously assume sovereignty over, and undertake to create State order for, such a politically incompetent population.

The civilized State should not, of course, act with undue haste in seizing power, once assumed, for any other purpose than that for which the assumption may be righteously made, *viz.*, for the civilization of the subjected population; but they are under no obligation to await invitation from those claiming power and government in the inefficient organization, nor from those subject to the same. The civilized States themselves are the best organs which have yet appeared in the history of the world for determining the proper time and occasion for intervening in the affairs of unorganized or insufficiently organized populations, for the execution of their great world-duty.—"*Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law*," by *J. W. Burgess*, *Vol. I*, *pp. 46-48*.

CHAPTER VI

FORCE SUPPLEMENTED BY FALSEHOOD

THE attempt to govern men by organized force results in their government through organized falsehood and deception. Masters who control their slaves through mutual exchange of services, may deal with them on the basis of candor. But they who govern by force are obliged to deceive. They must exaggerate their own power, must conceal weak points, must make the slave believe that he is more helpless than he really is. The use of an army also involves deception. The general is morally bound to deceive his enemy. A soldier who would not lie to the enemy under certain conditions would be court martialed. War includes falsehood as a necessary agency, and when the army is sent to rule the State this quality is not changed.

(1) If the many are to obey and the few to give commands, in order to have peace, there must be no mistake as to who they are who must obey and who shall command. Plato, who is most explicit in his teaching that the many are born to serve, likewise teaches that among the subject classes some natural rulers are born; while among the ruling classes are born natural subjects.[1] Yet a State founded on force

can admit no such principle. The subject class must be taught that they are by nature subject. The authority of the rulers must be above suspicion. In such a State, the tendency is to the establishment of an impassable gulf between the classes. Hence the caste systems of Asia.

(2) As stated in a former lesson, governments supported by mere brute force are short-lived. They have in themselves the elements of ruin. Impending ruin is prevented by resort to some superstition, some beliefs and opinions born of fear. As both rulers and subjects are victims of common fears, they alike become victims of common erroneous beliefs. Then, in all good conscience, the rulers who are *ex-officio* in the position of teachers, impose upon their subjects a body of erroneous opinions and beliefs. Thus the very escape from brutality and anarchy is made to depend upon the acceptance of erroneous teachings. The teaching must be imposed, it must be accepted without question, it must be believed in as infallible, and to this end it must be put forth with divine sanction. Men are kept from killing each other by being preoccupied by a vast system of religious ceremony with infinite and growing detail. There thus arises a class of experts in religious ceremonial, whose ministrations are necessary to the preservation of the State. The State comes to be dependent upon these beliefs. To allow these beliefs to be questioned is treason to the State.

VIEW FROM THE CITY WALL, PEKIN CHINA

In such a State the learned classes become separated from the people. Learning becomes the peculiar treasure of the few. The people must be kept in the belief that the learned live in another world, that they are possessed of mysteries wholly above the apprehension of the common herd. The teaching must therefore be kept quite distinct from matters of every day life and observation. It must pertain to another world, or to a long-forgotten age. That which is taught must be accepted as true whether it is true or not. In such a State all regard for the truth must be eliminated and men must believe and teach only that which seems necessary to preserve the State. Society comes to be founded upon beliefs which will not bear investigation: to investigate becomes treason. Progress must cease. The very idea of progress must be eliminated, because this would imply that the teachers are not infallible.

(3) These conditions are fulfilled in such a State as China was before the advent of Western influences. Such governments were being established in Europe at the close of the Middle Ages before the Reformation. Similar qualities may be discovered in the Russian government today. Any State which is organized upon the theory that one person or a select few are to rule and the many are to obey, can be made enduring only as the minds of the subject class are either paralyzed by fear or controlled by false teaching. All this tends to destroy those qualities upon which the

Western State is based. Western Democracy aims to secure the consent and coöperation of all its citizens. It may employ force in dealing with the exceptional and abnormal man, but it depends more and more upon an enlightened public opinion. The many are encouraged to think, to question, to persuade. By the free exercise of the minds of all, the sense of unity grows more distinct. Without this sense of unity, the sense of a common patriotism, a recognition of public opinion, there can be no State as the term is coming to be used in the West. Ancient Babylonia was not a State. Asia produced no great State until the advent of new and Westernized Japan. The so-called Asiatic States have been founded upon force, upon superstition, upon deception and erroneous teaching, and all these tend to destroy and to forestall the development of public opinion.

Western Democracy does not simply propose a change in the form of government. It proposes to build a State upon different principles. In the place of force it will substitute reason and conscience; in the place of superstition it will progressively seek to realize the highest ideals of religion and morality; in the place of erroneous beliefs, deception and falsehood, it will seek to cast the lie out of politics and industry, and to suffer no institution to survive which cannot endure the light of day.

All governments, therefore, of every name and kind are founded upon education. In the despotic State,

education is imposed by force, and some faculties are paralyzed while others are abnormally developed. In the democratic State education is induced by friendly coöperation, and the State aims at the harmonious development of all the faculties.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER VI

Force Supplemented by Falsehood

[1] **Plato's Teaching.**—"How then may we devise one of those falsehoods in the hour of need," I said, "which we lately spoke of—just one royal lie which may deceive the rulers, if that be possible, and at any rate the rest of the city?"

"What sort of lie?" he said.

"Nothing new," I replied; "only an old Phoenician tale of what has often occurred before now in other places (as the poets say, and have made the world believe), though not in our time, and which is indeed not very likely to occur again, and still more unlikely to be believed."

"Your words," he said, "seem to hesitate on your lips."

"You will not wonder," I replied, "at my hesitation when you have heard."

"Speak," he said, "and fear not."

"Well, then, I will speak, although I really know not how to look you in the face, or in what words to utter the audacious fiction, which I propose to communicate gradually, first to the rulers, then to the soldiers, and lastly to the people.

"They are to be informed that their youth was a dream, and the education and training which they received from us an appearance only; in reality during all that time they were in process of formation and nourishment in the womb of the earth, where they themselves and their arms and appurtenances were manufactured; and when they were completed, the earth, their mother, sent them up; and their country being their mother also, and their nurse, they are therefore bound to advise for her good, and to defend her against attacks, and her citizens

they are to regard as children of the earth, and their own brothers."

"I cannot wonder," he said, "at your feeling ashamed of uttering the lie."

"Nay," I replied, "there is more yet. I have not told you all. 'Citizens,' we shall say to them in our tale, 'you are brothers, yet God has framed you differently. Some of you have the power of command, and these he has composed of gold, wherefore also they have the greatest honor; others of silver, to be auxiliaries; others again who are to be husbandmen and craftsmen he has made of brass and iron, and the species will generally be preserved in the children. But as you are of the same original family, a golden parent will sometimes have a silver son, or a silver parent, a golden son.

"'And God proclaims to the rulers, as a first principle, that before all they should watch over their offspring, and see what elements mingle in their nature, for if the son of a golden or silver parent has an admixture of brass and iron, then nature orders a transposition of ranks, and the eye of the ruler must not be pitiful towards his child, because he has to descend in the scale and become a husbandman or artisan, just as there may be others sprung from the artisan class who are raised to honor, and become guardians and auxiliaries. For an oracle says that when a man of brass or iron guards the State, it will then be destroyed.' Such is the tale. Is there any possibility of making our citizens believe in it?"

"Not in the present generation," he replied, "I do not see any way of accomplishing this, but their sons may be made to believe, and their sons' sons, and posterity after them."—*The Republic," Vol. III (Jowett's translation).*

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER VI

Force Supplemented by Falsehood

[1] **Plato's Teaching.**—"How then may we devise one of those falsehoods in the hour of need," I said, "which we lately spoke of—just one royal lie which may deceive the rulers, if that be possible, and at any rate the rest of the city?"

"What sort of lie?" he said.

"Nothing new," I replied; "only an old Phoenician tale of what has often occurred before now in other places (as the poets say, and have made the world believe), though not in our time, and which is indeed not very likely to occur again, and still more unlikely to be believed."

"Your words," he said, "seem to hesitate on your lips."

"You will not wonder," I replied, "at my hesitation when you have heard."

"Speak," he said, "and fear not."

"Well, then, I will speak, although I really know not how to look you in the face, or in what words to utter the audacious fiction, which I propose to communicate gradually, first to the rulers, then to the soldiers, and lastly to the people.

"They are to be informed that their youth was a dream, and the education and training which they received from us an appearance only; in reality during all that time they were in process of formation and nourishment in the womb of the earth, where they themselves and their arms and appurtenances were manufactured; and when they were completed, the earth, their mother, sent them up; and their country being their mother also, and their nurse, they are therefore bound to advise for her good, and to defend her against attacks, and her citizens

they are to regard as children of the earth, and their own brothers."

"I cannot wonder," he said, "at your feeling ashamed of uttering the lie."

"Nay," I replied, "there is more yet; I have not told you all. 'Citizens,' we shall say to them in our tale, 'you are brothers, yet God has framed you differently. Some of you have the power of command, and these he has composed of gold, wherefore also they have the greatest honor; others of silver, to be auxiliaries; others again who are to be husbandmen and craftsmen he has made of brass and iron; and the species will generally be preserved in the children. But as you are of the same original family, a golden parent will sometimes have a silver son, or a silver parent, a golden son.

"'And God proclaims to the rulers, as a first principle, that before all they should watch over their offspring, and see what elements mingle in their nature; for if the son of a golden or silver parent has an admixture of brass and iron, then nature orders a transposition of ranks, and the eye of the ruler must not be pitiful towards his child, because he has to descend in the scale and become a husbandman or artisan, just as there may be others sprung from the artisan class who are raised to honor, and become guardians and auxiliaries. For an oracle says that when a man of brass or iron guards the State, it will then be destroyed.' Such is the tale. Is there any possibility of making our citizens believe in it?"

"Not in the present generation," he replied; "I do not see any way of accomplishing this; but their sons may be made to believe, and their sons' sons, and posterity after them."—*"The Republic," Vol. III (Jowett's translation).*

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW. PART V

1. What do the words "Asia has produced no State" mean? How old is the idea of the modern State? What are some of the peculiar difficulties encountered by one who attempts to describe the modern State? What is the essential difference between ancient and modern democracies? Was the Grecian democracy simply one of three forms of government? What was Plato's ideal of the State? What is really meant by the statement "Democracy is not a mere form of government"?

2. What is the common view of the relation of force to government? What does force mean? What causes the crow to avoid the scare-crow? What is the difference between the control of an engine and the control of a horse? Is the control of an engine properly called "government"? What is meant by taming a wild animal? Do men govern domestic animals by force? How does the Reign of Terror illustrate the attempt to base government on force?

3. What is the difference between the government of domestic animals and the government of human beings? Why does the control of men lead to a greater use of force than the control of animals? What is

vicarious punishment? How did war lead to the formation of a ruling class? Do war and slavery rest upon force? Is there any other government so simple? What is the origin of slavery? What influence would economic changes have on the institution?

4. Which is the more important factor in primitive government, force or superstition? Superstition and force are alike in what respect? In actual slavery what must there be besides force? In the discipline of an army what? How does an army govern a State? Why is the military despotism short lived? What sort of support is essential?

5. Is there any sort of government which is not dependent upon education? What are radical differences between the education suited to a despotism, and education suited to a democracy? What are the contradictory pieces of human nature involved in the two governments? What is the end of education in a despotism? Can a despotism exist if free inquiry is permitted?

6. Does slavery necessarily involve falsehood? Does military discipline? Do military operations? Why must the rulers in a despotic State be accounted infallible? Does the reputation for infallibility of rulers involve deception? Can there be a sense of unity in a State governed by force and fraud? What are the distinctive principles of the Western State? What has been the position accorded education among the nations? How far does civilization rest upon educa-

tion? How would Plato use a fable for political purposes?

SUBJECTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY

1. For opposing view to that advanced in Maine's "Popular Government," see T. H. Green's "Political Obligation."

2. Study current accounts of the Chinese and Japanese governments.

3. Study arguments in favor of slavery before the war with special reference to its effect on candor.

4. Uncle Tom's Cabin.

5. Systems of education in Turkey and China.

PART VI

Hindrances to Democracy

CHAPTER I

NEW WINE IN OLD BOTTLES

ANIMALS are governed when they are so trained and educated that from mere sign or suggestion they will fulfill the wishes of men. In common with men, animals have the power of conscious self-direction. Man governs animals by availing himself of this power. But animals are trained individually; one cannot be taught to teach another. Men, on the other hand, are trained socially. To men there belongs not only consciousness but also conscientiousness. In all dealings of man with man there inheres the sense of right. It is this which makes man a political animal. The State, therefore, is founded upon a sense of right conduct directed to rational ends.

(1) The attempt to govern men by brute force tends to paralyze reason and to destroy the sense of right. Force, except as a limited and subordinate agency in the training of men, tends to destroy the State. No enduring State ever has been or ever can be founded upon force. In Asia the destructive tendencies of force were resisted by the formation of castes

whereby immense bodies of men were held together through friendly coöperation and the social instincts. The destructive tendency of force was still farther resisted through the conscientious belief in many errors and superstitions whereby the ruling classes exercised spiritual control over their subjects. Yet, until affected by Western ideas, Asia produced no State in the modern sense because the rulers believed in a government by force, and the natural tendency of such a belief is the destruction of all government.

(2) The Western State differs from the Asiatic State primarily through the prevalence of a belief in a God of Truth and Righteousness. Or, stated in another form, through the prevalence of a belief in a Higher Law binding alike upon rulers and subjects. The Higher Law not only permits but requires the subject under given conditions to defy the ruler. Pilate said to a prisoner, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee?" The answer was, "Thou couldst have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above." Peter and John having been imprisoned and scourged and commanded to speak no more in this Name, replied: "We ought to obey God rather than man." The Christian Church was an outlaw until half the Roman Empire had become Christian.

(3) The Call of Abraham should not be viewed simply as an isolated fact in history. We may believe that thousands of times the conscientious Asiatic has

gone West to escape from tyranny. The Greeks and Romans were transplanted Asiatics. Among them also there is a suggestion of a sense of a higher law. This is shown in the honor that is paid to the destroyer of tyrants; in the demand of the plebeians that their laws be written down so that the rulers may be required to obey them.[1] But the case of the descendants of Abraham is unique in the clearness with which they enunciated and exemplified the principles of the Higher Law. The ruler in the Hebrew State was not merely subject to the law as was the ordinary citizen. It was in a peculiar sense his mission to obey the law. For a king or a priest to disregard the law was a peculiarly heinous offense. Often did the unauthorized private citizen rebuke the ruler for his disobedience. Among the Greeks and Romans the hero was often the man who drew the sword on behalf of liberty. But among the Hebrews he was the greater hero who wielded the "sword of the spirit," the Word of the Lord, against the oppressor. The Hebrew exalted preaching above brute force. Early did the Hebrew Prophet get a clear vision of a State founded upon righteousness where there would be none to hurt nor to make afraid. More than upon the ideals of Greeks and Romans the modern Western State is being built upon Hebrew ideals.

(4) All human institutions are founded upon opinions and beliefs.[2] Even the family assumes diverse forms according to the convictions of its members. The Asiatic anti-State is founded upon the belief that

the few are born to command and the many to obey.[3] The Western State is founded upon the conviction that all men are subject to a common moral law. This moral law lays peculiar obligations upon all who are in places of conspicuous power and influence. By as much as one is exalted in official position, or wealth, or learning, by so much is his obligation to obedience increased. It was because Ahab was King that the taking of Naboth's vineyard was an act of supreme meanness.

The West has differed from the East in that there has been there at all times an appeal to the Higher Law. There has been a growing sense of the imperfection of human government; a growing sense of the injustice of rulers. Among Asiatics there can scarcely be said to exist a common morality. There is a caste or family morality, but not a common morality. But in the Western State this sense of common morality is fundamental. It is the very life of the State. Yet the rulers in the West have ever held Asiatic convictions. They have been disposed to bind heavy burdens, to claim for themselves peculiar sanctity, peculiar privileges, to teach that the only right of the common man is to serve and obey his betters.[4] Yet from the days of the early Hebrew prophet until now there have ever been among the people those who were ready at the risk of their own lives to read the law to the rulers. A sense of common morality has grown as the people have been made conscious of the oppressions and the injustice of

rulers. Instead of forming themselves into castes, the peoples of the West have organized themselves into schools for moral instruction. Each class has been peculiarly diligent in detecting and pointing out the moral delinquencies of those whom they have regarded as the oppressors. Rulers preach to people and people preach to rulers. One industrial class points out the sins of another industrial class. Thus all have a share in moral instruction.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER I

New Wine in Old Bottles

[1] **Origin of the Twelve Tables.**—The plebeians, under the direction of their tribunes, vigorously followed up the important advantage they had gained, and, after a long resistance on the part of the patricians, success, at least in part, attended their effort. It was clear that the law, public and private, had two fundamental defects: on the one hand, it was indefinite and unfamiliar to the common herd; and, on the other, it bore unequally on the two orders of society. An unknown and mysterious power, it was a formidable weapon in the hands of the patricians, and enabled them to keep the lower orders in check and under their control. The efforts of the plebeians were therefore directed mainly to two things: to secure publicity and equal laws for all classes *(æquanda libertas:—summis infimisque jura æquare)*. And, with this object in view, they demanded that the *positive* laws of the republic should be reduced to writing and promulgated.

Notwithstanding the obscurity which attends this question, we can see that the point contended for was nothing less than the equalization of the two orders: this was what the patricians were opposing throughout the struggle from consulate to consulate, which lasted with various vicissitudes from B. C. 462 to B. C. 451. According to some historians three patricians, whose names are mentioned, were sent to Greece in the year B. C. 454, in order to collect the laws of that country; and upon their return two years afterwards with the Attic laws Hermodorus, an exile from Ephesus, to whose honor a statue was erected at Rome, explained them to the people. The story of their mission

to Greece was firmly believed by the Romans, but ever since the time of Vico it has been questioned by critical historians.

Treated as fable by some, and admitted to rest upon the evidence of certain monuments by others, this story must be allowed to remain among the numerous problems of Roman history which cannot be cleared up. We do not consider that much importance, in a legal point of view, attaches to this controversy.

This much, however, appears certain, that the Greek laws were not unknown to the compilers of the Twelve Tables; and though they imitated the Greek laws in certain trivial details, yet the basis of the Roman civil law is not borrowed, but original, and possesses its own characteristic features, and it is as such that we must regard it.

Be that as it may, in the year 303 (B.C. 451) from the foundation of Rome, according to the calculation of the Romans, and in the year which followed the return of its deputies, that is, if we accept the fact of the mission as a reality, ten magistrates were chosen by the *comitia* from the order of the senators, and were commissioned to draw up the civil laws of their republic. — *"Ortolan's History of Roman Law," by Itudus T. Prichard and David Nasmith, pp. 96-98.*

Customary Law Codes.—From the period of customary law we come to another sharply defined epoch in the history of jurisprudence. We arrive at the era of codes, those ancient codes of which the Twelve Tables of Rome were the most famous specimen.

In Greece, in Italy, on the Hellenized seaboard of Western Asia, these codes all made their appearance at periods much the same everywhere, not, I mean, at periods identical in point of time, but similar in point of the relative progress of each community.

Everywhere, in the countries I have named, laws engraven on tablets and published to the people take the place of usages deposited with the recollection of a privileged oligarchy.

It must not for a moment be supposed that the refined considerations now urged in favor of what is called codification had a part or place in the change I have described. The ancient

codes were doubtless originally suggested by the discovery and diffusion of the art of writing.

It is true that the aristocracies seem to have abused their monopoly of legal knowledge; and at all events their exclusive possession of the law was a formidable impediment to the success of those popular movements which began to be universal in the western world.

But, though Democratic sentiment may have added to their popularity, the codes were certainly in the main a direct result of the invention of writing. Inscribed tablets were seen to be a better depository of law, and a better security for its accurate preservation, than the memory of a number of persons, however strengthened by habitual exercise.—*"Ancient Law," by Maine, pp. 13, 14.*

[3] **The Hindu Caste System.**—The word "caste" is derived from the Latin term Castus, which signified purity of breed. It was the term used by Vasco da Gama and his fellow Portuguese adventurers, four centuries ago, as they landed upon the southwestern coast of India and began to study the social and religious condition of the people. The word expressed to them the remarkable bond which held the people together; the subsequent generation of foreigners and English-speaking natives have adopted it as the most appropriate term to express the unique system which prevails all over India. No other people, in the history of the world, have erected a social structure comparable to this of India. For twenty-five centuries it has controlled the life of nearly one-sixth of the human race. Other countries have, or have had, tribal connections, class distinctions, trade unions, religious sects, philanthropic fraternities, social guilds, and various other organizations. But India is the only land where all these are practically welded together into one consistent and mighty whole, which dictates the every detail of human relationship and controls the whole destiny of man for time and eternity. For it should be remembered that India has consistently declined to recognize any distinction between the social and the religious. These are the reverse and the obverse of life; they are brought to the same rules and must yield

A GROUP OF JAPANESE WOMEN

obedience to the same authority. Religion to the Hindu permeates the whole social domain; and social order draws its sanctions from, and is enforced by the penalties of, religion. To marry outside one's caste, to eat food cooked by an outcast, to cross the ocean, to delay unduly the marriage of a daughter, —these and a thousand other delinquencies which may seem absolutely harmless to a Westerner, are not only regarded as social irregularities, but also as sins whose penalties will harass the soul beyond the grave or burning-ground. Herein does caste reveal its uniqueness, and from this does it pass on to the exercise of its extraordinary tyranny over the people.

The origin of caste is a subject of much uncertainty and debate. In ancient Vedic times, caste was unknown. Society, in those days, was more elastic and free, and resembled that of other lands. And yet it showed a tendency toward a mechanical division which later grew into the caste system. It was not until the time of the great lawgiver, Manu, about twenty five centuries ago, that the system crystallized into laws, and the organization became so compact as to force itself on all the people and become an integral part of recognized Hindu law. Manu and other lawgivers found the basis of caste rules in the traditions of an ancient Brahman tribe. These they elaborated and enforced.

The ancient name for caste was "Varna," which means "colour." This name is suggestive, and has led many authorities to trace back the whole system to original race purity, as indicated by the colour of the skin. The first incursion of the fair Aryans from the northwest settled down, it is claimed, in the northern portions of the country. They gradually mingled and intermarried with the dark skinned Dravidian and aboriginal population, with the natural consequence of a loss of race-purity and of whiteness of complexion. A subsequent descent of a new Aryan host upon the plains of northern India found the descendants of their predecessors of a darker hue than themselves, which bespoke their race degeneracy; so they kept aloof from them. Later, however, they began to mingle with the former inhabitants, so that their descendants partly lost the ancestral complexion. A still later Aryan incursion declined to have intercourse with

the descendants of those who last preceded them. Thus we have four classes divided upon the basis of colour, or varna, which may correspond with the four great original castes of India.

The traditional theory of the Hindus themselves, in reference to caste origin, is admirably simple and quite adequate to satisfy ninety-nine per cent of the devotees of that faith to-day. Brahma, the first god of the Hindu triad, the Creator, was the immediate source and founder of the caste order; for he caused, it is said, the august Brahman to proceed out of his divine mouth, while the warlike and royal Kshatriya emanated from his shoulders, the trading, commercial Vaisya, from his thighs, the menial Suda, from his feet. And from these four primal classes have descended, through myriads of permutations and minglings, the present hydra-headed caste organization.

But modern and scientific students of the social order of India entirely discard and ignore all Hindu mythical explanations and Puranic legends concerning this subject, and endeavour to trace the present system to its sources and primal causes through patient historic research and through a most elaborate system of anthropometric and ethnographic examinations conducted all over the land. The subject, however, is so vast and complicated that authorities upon the subject are still considerably at variance in their theories of origin.—*"India: Its Life and Thought," by John P. Jones, pp. 91-95.*

[4] **Popular and Legal Power.**—What though the government by the people be a thing not to be endured, much less defended, yet many men please themselves with an opinion that though the people may not govern, yet they may partake and join with a king in the government, and so make a State mixed of popular and regal power, which they take to be the best tempered and equalest form of government. But the vanity of this fancy is too evident, it is a mere impossibility or contradiction; for if a king but once admit the people to be his companions, he ceases to be king, and the State becomes a Democracy.—*Filmer's "Patriarcha," Chap. II.*

CHAPTER II

"THE TYRANNY OF MAJORITIES"

THE conflict between the East and the West is a conflict of ideas. But we make a fatal mistake if we believe that the fundamental ideas are distributed either according to race or to geographical area. The Hebrew State, though located in Asia, was Western in spirit, while many European States have been Eastern in their dominant characteristics. In general the beliefs and teachings of the ruling classes have been, and continue to be, identical in Europe and Asia. They believe and teach that the masses of mankind can be governed only by an exercise of brute force wielded by the few. In both the East and the West this teaching has tended directly to destroy the State. In the East this tendency to destruction has been arrested by resistance among the people taking the form of caste and unchanging superstitions. In the West this tendency to destruction has been resisted by a direct denial of the fundamental teaching of the rulers. The duty to obey has been met by the higher claims of the moral law. In both Asia and Europe the enduring quality in the State, that which has prevented utter collapse and ruin, has been the moral stamina of the people. The caste system of Asia gives the lie to the high claims of rulers as

effectively as did the attitude of John Knox or Elijah the Tishbite. The West has been progressive, while the East has been stationary, because here the rulers have been included in a common subjection to the moral law.

(1) In a former lesson we have seen that all government of every sort rests upon education and training. In the West, as well as in the East, the ruling classes have attempted to educate by an appeal to brute force. The natural effect of such an attempt is to destroy the State and produce anarchy; or to introduce such a separation of the people into artificial classes as to render a common morality impossible. These tendencies are universal: they exist without reference to race or geography. The West differs from the East simply in the degree of success in the attempt to educate by force. The West differs especially from the East in that there has been a growing tendency to educate by an appeal to a common sense of moral obligation. The democratic State of the nineteenth century is the direct result of this appeal. It has taken thousands of years of perpetual conflict to reach this ideal. And the most perfect of the modern democratic States are still handicapped and prevented from fulfilling their appropriate functions because the educated classes in these States are still victims of thousands of years of teaching of war-club philosophy.[1] I have quoted from Sir Henry Maine an illustration of this principle. The teaching still prevails that government

is a mere application of force. So long as this opinion is widely accepted, democracy can never have a fair trial.

(2) There is, moreover, a deep and inveterate prejudice against government, which pervades all classes of the community. It is said, there are no snakes in Ireland, yet I once saw a stalwart Irishman waiting for some one to accompany him through a patch of weeds for fear of snakes. He was in a country where there never had been dangerous reptiles; where snakes were not a whit more dangerous than kittens. He was simply a victim of the race prejudice against snakes. There doubtless was a time when the prejudice had a rational basis. Governments, we are taught, came into existence by means of a war-club in the hands of a head-breaking savage. All rulers of every name and kind are simply successors to the primitive head-breaker. Rulers have maintained their position by the use of every imaginable instrument of torture, by every imaginable indignity heaped upon the human body. They have appeared as enemies of the people, so that government has many times been defined as a conspiracy of the few against the many for purposes of rapine and plunder. In the light of such experiences extending over many thousand years, it is not at all strange that there should exist a widespread prejudice against government; that government in itself should come to have about it the odor of cruelty and injustice, and be regarded as something to be feared and hated.

(3) It is this prejudice against government which lends terror to the hobgoblin of the "tyranny of majorities."[2] It is difficult to find instances where majorities have committed acts of tyranny, and in nearly all of the alleged instances the voting power is really wielded by the few. So far as any real experience goes, it would seem that nothing can be safer than an intelligent majority of the citizens of a State. Yet there exists everywhere a diffused dread of majorities. This is simply one form of the diffused dread of government. Sir Henry Maine appeals to this irrational fear when he gives a list of the outrageous things which majorities would have done if they had only had a chance. There was a time when starving laborers in England broke some machines which seemed to them the cause of their wretchedness. Upon this Sir Henry makes the dogmatic statement that a majority of the English people would have voted against modern improvements and in favor of middle age destitution.[3] How does he know this? Why not suppose that if the English people had been sufficiently enlightened to adopt a policy settling questions by majorities there would have been no riotous attacks upon machinery? There is just as much reason in the statement that the riots occurred because of a lack of a habit of consulting majorities, as to allege that a majority of the people would have sustained the policy of the rioters. Yet Sir Henry's statement, irrational

as it is, has great effect, because it appeals to an inborn prejudice.

Democracy cannot have a fair chance until a prejudice which millenniums of tyranny have wrought into the race has been educated out of it.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER II

"The Tyranny of Majorities"

[1] **The State an End Rather than a Means.**—The ancients generally considered the State to be an end. There was hardly any realm within which the individual was considered to be free as of right; no part of his life was acknowledged to be sacred from the intrusion of the State. The old Mosaic law regulated almost every concern of his daily life,—what he should eat and when, how his food should be cooked and served, the kind of clothes he should wear, and when and whom he should marry, etc. Nor was legislation of this character peculiar to the Hebrews. It was common among the Greeks and Romans and, to a less extent, among the early Germans. In short, the idea of individual interest as distinct from the general interests was non-existent. The individual was always under the eye of the State; his conduct was regulated and his life determined for him with such minuteness that he was regarded as existing for the State rather than the State for him. Individual freedom was overlooked or its importance minimized, while the State was exalted and glorified as if it were everything and the individual nothing. Modern political thought and practice, however, reject the view that the State is an end rather than a means. It considers the State to be simply an institution, an agency or instrumentality by means of which the collective ends of society may be realized, instead of itself being the end.—"*Introduction to Political Science*," *by James Wilford Garner, p. 312.*

[2] **The Right of Majorities.**—Since Mr. Spencer has adopted an abstract conception of sovereignty, it is no wonder that he is puzzled over "the divine right of majorities." It is obvious that the majority of a majority of a majority may be arith-

Capitals of the World

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

metically a very small minority of the whole. Therefore, it is inferred, there is no reason why a cabinet (*i.e.*, its majority), which has the confidence of a House of Commons (*i.e.*, of its majority), which has the confidence of the nation (*i.e.*, of its majority), should have any particular authority to dictate to us. Of course, this way of arguing is only valid if the nation is *merely* an aggregate of individuals, an idea which comes strangely from one who talks about a social organism.

* * * * * * * *

Some of us really do believe that, in some respects, society is an organism, though perhaps we do not repeat our creed so often as Mr. Spencer. As to the right of minorities, it may be enough at present to point out that the most important and valuable right of a minority is the right to turn itself into a majority if it can—*i.e.*, the right of freedom of speech and freedom of association, not the impossible right of the member to exist apart from the organic whole.

History shows us that a minority with intelligence, energy, and faith in their cause may hope with a fair chance for ultimate victory, if their cause is really the cause of humanity. One hundred men are numerically more than ten, and ten than one; but the genius and earnestness and contagious enthusiasm of one and the strong coherence of ten will outweigh in the end the isolated apathy of many thousands. It is the very chief advantage of democracy over oligarchy that, while it establishes the power of the majority, it puts that majority potentially in the hands of those who have ideas and are able to make them spread. For the wise statesman of a free country is not the man who has a mere private theory of his own and imposes it on a passive and subject class, but the man who sympathetically comprehends the vague wants, the unformulated aspirations of the half-blind, half-dumb many whom he serves by leading. As a leader he is in advance of others, not because his ideas are not theirs, but just in so far as he can understand and express what they only feel.

A people who, like the Russian peasantry, accept only a unanimous decision as binding, have advanced a very small way in

political development. The discovery that "counting heads would save the trouble of breaking them" marks one of the greatest advances that mankind have made in their hard upward course. The discovery of the "organic" system of representation marks another, and the significance of "public opinion" a still further stage. The acts of the government in every country which is not on the verge of a revolution are not the acts of a minority of individuals, but the acts of the uncrowned and invisible sovereign, the spirit of the nation itself.—*"Principles of State Interference," by D. G. Ritchie, pp. 70-74.*

[3] **Prospects of Popular Government.**—Universal suffrage, which today excludes Free Trade from the United States, would certainly have prohibited the spinning-jenny and the power-loom. It would certainly have forbidden the threshing-machine. It would have prevented the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar; and it would have restored the Stuarts. It would have proscribed the Roman Catholics with the mob which burned Lord Mansfield's house and library in 1780, and it would have proscribed the Dissenters with the mob which burned Dr. Priestley's house and library in 1791.—*"Popular Government," by Sir Henry Maine, p. 36.*

CHAPTER III

THE "LAISSEZ FAIRE" THEORY OF GOVERNMENT

THE ancient prejudice against government may serve to explain the various uses made of the luckless phrases "*Laissez faire*" and "*laissez passer.*" As first used by the physiocrats of the 18th century, the words were made to mean "let people work, let them trade." They expressed no theory of the State farther than was involved in the liberty to work and to trade. Later economists dwell much upon the injuries to industry through unjust governmental interference. Individual activity and voluntary association they contrasted with governmental interference. Under such teachings the conviction grew that that government was best which governed least. The perfect government would be no government at all. Government is an evil. So far as it is necessary at all, it is a necessary evil. In some way the term "*Laissez faire*" came to be applied to this negative theory of government: The theory which would reduce all government to the lowest terms and leave to the individual and to voluntary association the widest possible field.[1] The extreme form of this theory is reached in the position of the anarchist who would abolish all government.

The theory has its roots deep in the past and deep

in human nature. From the primitive war-club rule of the savage to the present so-called government by majorities, governments have been doing violence to man's better nature; they have been violating the moral sense of the people. In opposition to their rulers, the people have formed ties and associations which have kept the State from ruin. Early in the last century, at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, a great peace came over Christendom. It was certainly natural that men should ask the question: Since in all forms of human government that have ever been tried there is so much that is unjust and cruel, and since the people left to themselves are so resourceful and have shown so great ability to attain a fair degree of justice, why not eliminate government altogether? or, at least, why not restrict it to the narrowest possible range of activity? This view of government has found abundant expression, and it has received the approval of many of the wisest men of the century.

(1) This *Laissez faire* theory of government, supported by eminent statesmen, reformers, and philosophers, has the natural support of all the prejudice against government engendered by the tyranny of all the ages. It will be observed that the theory came into existence just at the time when modern democracies were making their first attempts in the discredited business of governing. Democracy has had no enemies so insidious and so effective as the believers in *Laissez faire.* Many of them were themselves

professed democrats. Few have been open and avowed enemies. Yet they have said to the untried and inexperienced democratic governments, with their awkward and unpractised voters, that they should confine their activities to the one business of administering justice and leave every other activity to the individual and to voluntary association.[2] Now the one business which in all reason is the most difficult which man has at any time attempted is that of administering justice. Governments have managed farms and distributed the fruit thereof. They have engaged in mining, in manufacture, in transportation, in almost every line of human endeavor, and have succeeded fairly well. But in the one business of administering justice they have not succeeded. The very best that can be said is that some methods and some administrations are less unjust than others. It is this very failure which constitutes the basis of the *Laissez faire* philosophy. If a government could be found under any form or name which could do the one thing, administer justice, then surely everything else might be left to the will of the individual.

(2) At the hands of the promoters of individual and private enterprise the new democracies have incurred relentless and hostile criticism. Every attempt of the government to engage in a sort of business in which there was any reason to expect success, has been exposed to ridicule and public contempt. The acts of the government are compared with the corresponding acts of the most intelligent, the most honest, and the

most public-spirited citizens. Some of these philosophers maintain that the post-office business would be more efficient and satisfactory in the hands of private companies; that the education of youth should be left to parents and to voluntary associations. The public telegraph is unfavorably compared with the private telegraph; the public railway with the private railway; the public water supply, light-supply, and street-car service with the corresponding enterprises in the hands of private companies.

(3) The teachings of the *Laissez faire* philosophers have been reinforced by the greed of business corporations and joint stock companies which, by voluntary association have acquired the power to exact tribute from the public. Judge Hubbard, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Attorney for the Northwestern Railway, once said that a business corporation for the purpose of private gain ought never to have been allowed to exist. This astute and experienced lawyer knows, as we may charitably suppose that Herbert Spencer and Professor Sumner do not know, that the courts of law have not been equal to the task of protecting the property of the stock-holders of a joint stock company. On the contrary, he knows that the judiciary has been an effective agency for unjustly appropriating the property of the minority of the stock-holders. As they have failed to do justice to the members of the business corporations, much more have they failed to effectively guard the rights of the less-interested public.

In England, and especially in the United States through the teachings of *Laissez faire* philosophers, appealing as they do to a most inveterate prejudice, and through lust for private gain, voluntary associations have shown a marked tendency to encroach upon civil government and to discredit all public endeavor. Switzerland has been peculiarly fortunate in this respect. No propaganda has appeared to array the individual against the State, and the poverty of the country has protected the people from the greed of business corporations. On the other hand, the people have used their towns, their communes, their cantons, and their general government, as voluntary associations which included them all, associations in which all have a sympathetic interest. Their public roads have long been the pride of the State and the admiration of foreigners. The same is true of the public telegraph. The citizen of Geneva pays the State a sum per year for a telephone service, such as costs the citizens of New York far more when paid to a company organized for private gain. The people of Switzerland are really coming to feel that their State, with its various subdivisions, is the most interesting and inspiring friendly society which it would be possible for them to join.* Democracy will not have a fair chance until the people are taught to look upon their government with a friendly sympathy. They are not likely to do this so long as leaders in education teach that government is a necessary evil. Teaching people to confide in a gov-

ernment so esteemed is like teaching mothers to substitute snakes for kittens for their children to play with. It will not succeed where there are those who appeal to the ancient prejudice.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER III

The "Laissez Faire" Theory of Government

[1] **Modern Views of Money-Making.**—A second result is a change in the attitude of economists towards State interference. When people thought that every business man was trying to serve himself at the expense of the community, a large number of restrictions of all kinds were brought into play. The commercial legislation of past centuries was a mass of such restrictions. Adam Smith and his successors showed that the bulk of this legislation had a very different effect from what was intended. Instead of preventing extortion, it prevented mutual service. Instead of enabling the nation as a whole to make money, it interfered with the development of its resources and the wise application of its labor. To so great an extent were the economists able to point out the evil results of mistaken legislation that, in the popular mind, the teaching of economics has become synonymous with the effort to reduce the activity of government to a minimum. The phrase *Laissez faire, laissez passer* (let things take their own course), which was the motto of the physiocrats, has taken an exaggerated hold on the public imagination, and has been regarded as a fundamental axiom of economic science, when it is in fact only a practical maxim of political wisdom, subject to all the limitations which experience may afford.—"*Economics*," *by Arthur Twining Hadley, pp. 11, 12.*

[2] **Private Enterprise.**—As it is, however, they seem to have read backward the parable of the talents. Not to the agent of approved efficiency do they consign further duties, but to the negligent and blundering agent. Private enterprise has done much and done it well. Private enterprise has cleared, drained, and fertilized the country, and built the towns—has excavated

mines, laid out roads, dug canals, and embanked railways; has invented, and brought to perfection, plows, looms, steam engines, printing presses, and machines innumerable; has built our ships, our vast manufactories, our docks; has established banks, insurance societies, and the newspaper press; has covered the sea with lines of steam vessels, and the land with electric telegraphs. Private enterprise has brought agriculture, manufactures, and commerce to their present height, and is now developing them with increasing rapidity. Therefore, do not trust private enterprise. On the other hand, the State so fulfills its protective function as to ruin many, delude others, and frighten away those who most need succor; its national defenses are so extravagantly and yet inefficiently, administered as to call forth almost daily complaint, expostulation, or ridicule; and as the nation's steward, it obtains from some of our vast public estates a minus revenue. Therefore, trust the State. Slight the good, faithful servant and promote the unprofitable one, from one talent to ten.—*Spencer's Essays, "Moral, Political, and Æsthetic," p. 53.*

[2] **Swiss Enterprise.**—While I was in Geneva the city gained possession of the lighting plant of an outlying district which had previously been in hands of a company.

In a former letter I told you that wherever there was a new building there were smokestacks near, but in Geneva I saw much new building and almost an entire absence of smokestacks.

A few years ago the city began to utilize the power of the Rhone River, which comes out of the lake in a mighty torrent. They needed the water of the lake in their streets and houses, and they made the river pump the water.

The watch industry was languishing, on account of competition with the machine-made watch in America and elsewhere. The city corporation developed a system for distributing power to the local manufacturers through the pressure of water pumped from the Rhone by the Rhone. This gave a stimulus to many industries, and more and more power was demanded. When experience had demonstrated the economy of electricity as an agency for lighting, and for the distribution of power, the city gained possession of all electrical appliances and attached them

to their mill on the Rhone. By all these demands the power of the river as developed within the city limits was exhausted, and the demand for power to be used in manufacture was rapidly increasing.

To meet the demand, the city government secured a site four miles down the river, where they have constructed a dam of stone, which appears as permanent as Niagara Falls, and where they get an immense head of water. This new mill is now nearing completion. From it, power will be distributed by electricity and sold to small manufacturers in the city and suburbs. On my return to the city from my visit to the new mill I rode with a manufacturer from Zurich. He said that their company bought power from a private company, and that they paid three dollars for power which costs the Genevese manufacturer only two dollars.—*Jesse Macy, in "American Journal of Sociology," July, 1896.*

CHAPTER IV

MAN VERSUS THE STATE

A BANKER having listened to a lecture in which there were frequent references to public opinion and social consciousness remarked to me that all this talk about social consciousness was "nonsense. There is no such thing." There is an individual consciousness nothing more. Individuals have opinions but there is no such thing as public opinion. It has taken more than six thousand years of perpetual agony for the human race to develop a clear comprehension of the individual consciousness. There was a family consciousness, a consciousness of tribe and race, a class consciousness, a caste consciousness, a guild consciousness and a State consciousness, and last of all, at the end of the ages, there has been developed the consciousness of the individual. And the intoxicated victim of the new idea is disposed to turn his back upon the history of the race and deny its existence.

(1) But the advent of the individual consciousness has introduced much confusion into all reasoning about the State. Plato and Aristotle held long and intelligent discourses about the nature of the State without once suggesting that there could be such a thing as a conflict between the individual and the State. They assumed

that man's proper nature is political or social; that the perfect man requires the perfect city; that the one can not exist without the other. There would have been war in the little Greek heaven if a modern individualist had come stalking into the midst. The consciousness of a conflict between the individual and the State is distinctly modern. Yet the events leading to this consciousness are ancient and honorable. They are closely associated with the habit of Hebrew prophet and Christian teacher, who, in the name of righteousness, have stood up in the integrity of their own souls and been willing to defy tyrannical rulers. Such conduct is fitted to call attention to the importance of the individual. Surely the believer in modern democracy ought not to object to the attainment of a sense of the sacredness of the rights of the individual, for it is absolutely essential to the democratic State. A temporary inconvenience arises from a coincidence of the new ideas with ancient institutions.

(2) In a former chapter we have seen that a distinct enunciation of the principle of modern democracy occurred in England in the midst of the Puritan Revolution, along with a distinct recognition of the principle of religious toleration. We cannot be far from the truth in assuming that already leading minds were gaining a distinct apprehension of the importance of the individual.

(3) Just after the beheading of Charles I., Hobbes wrote his great book, called *The Leviathan*. In this he

propounded his famous Contract Theory of the State. According to Hobbes the material from which the State is made is separate and distinct individuals. Before the State is formed these individuals are in what he calls a "state of nature." In this state of nature each individual has a right to all goods. In this state of nature the individuals are equal, or at least each individual readily finds his match in another. Each individul having a right to all things naturally puts forth his powers to vindicate his right. This leads to universally diffused and perpetual war of equals against equals. The end of such a state is annihilation unless the reason of man can find a way of escape.

According to Mr. Hobbes deliverance is attained by each individual contracting with every other individual to surrender as large a share of his right to all goods as the others surrender. Then in order to see that this contract is enforced and perpetuated a sovereign is chosen.[1] Thus the people pass from a "state of nature" into a "state of civil society." Having chosen the sovereign the people have only one right left, one duty: it is the duty to obey. They have no right of revolution, no right to a voice in the government, no voice in the choice of rulers.

(4) In Hobbes' State we see a clear conception of the individual side by side with the baldest Asiatic view of government. After the State is formed the only thing permitted to the individual is obedience. Yet the State is created by the act of individuals contracting

with individuals. Yet even Hobbes does not admit that there is in his State a conflict between the individual and the government.[8] So appalling, in his view, is that state of nature from which the State preserves the individual, that it is better for the individual to obey, whatever may be the consequences.

The successors of Hobbes have been little affected by the hobgoblin of a state of nature, which was a creation of his fervid imagination, but they have been profoundly affected by the contrast which he has drawn between the individual and the government.[9] Hobbes' view of government holds, in large part, to the present day, while there has been a growing sense of the importance of the individual. Cords of books on politics and ethics have appeared during the last three centuries in which may be found the assumption that there is a natural and inevitable conflict between the individual and the State.

(5) If the one business of the State is that of governing, and government is defined as an agency for controlling the conduct of men by brute force, then there is conflict between the individual and the State so long as men survive who retain the individual consciousness. Under an economy of force Mr. Hobbes and Sir Henry Maine are correct in their reasoning that the natural form of government is that of a monarchy or a despotism. Under such a system democracy is an absurdity.

The individualist is either forced to the position of

the anarchist favoring no government at all, or he must consent to perpetual war between the State and the individual, or he must cease to think upon the subject, that is, he must cease to be an individualist.

Under a government founded upon force there can be no peace until the subjects of the government are crowded back into the earlier state in which they lose their individuality and are content with only a class consciousness. Democracy will have no fair trial while the great body of the citizens believe either in anarchy or despotism.

Capitols of the World

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER IV

Man Versus the State

[1] **Political Unity.**—The only way to erect such a common power as may be able to defend them from the invasion of foreigners and the injuries of one another, and thereby to secure them in such sort as that by their own industry, and by the fruits of the earth, they may enrich themselves and live contentedly, is to confer all their power and strength upon one man, or upon one assembly of men, that may reduce all their wills, by plurality of voices, unto one will: which is as much as to say, to appoint one man, or assembly of men, to bear their person; and every one to own and acknowledge himself to be the author of whatsoever he that so beareth their person shall act, or cause to be acted, in those things which concern the common peace and safety; and therein to submit their wills, every one to his will, and their judgments to his judgment.

This is more than concert, or concord; it is a real unity of them all, in one and the same person, made by covenant of every man with every man, in such manner, as if every man should say to every man, "I authorize and give up my right of governing myself, to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right of governing thyself, to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner."

This done the multitude so united in one person is called a "commonwealth," in Latin *civitas*. This is the generation of that great "Leviathan," or rather, to speak more reverently, of that "moral god" to which we owe under the "immortal God" our peace and defense. For by this authority, given him by every particular man in the commonwealth, he has the use of so much power and strength conferred on him, that by ter-

ror thereof, he is enabled to perform the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad.

And in him consisteth the essence of the commonwealth; which, to defend it, is "one person, of whose acts a great multitude, by mutual covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the author, to the end he may use the strength and means of them all, as he shall think expedient for their peace and common defense." And he that carrieth this person is called "Sovereign," and said to have "sovereign power"; and every one besides, his "subjects."—*Hobbes' "Leviathan," Part II, Chap. XVII.*

[8] **Unity of Power.**—So that it appeareth plainly, to my understanding, both from reason and Scripture, that the sovereign power, whether placed in one man, as in monarchy, or in one assembly of men, as in popular and aristocratic commonwealths, is as great as possibly men can be imagined to make it.

And though of so unlimited a power, men may fancy many evil consequences, yet the consequences of the want of it, which is perpetual war of every man against his neighbor, are much worse.

The condition of man in this life shall never be without inconveniences, but there happeneth in no commonwealth any great inconvenience but what proceeds from the subject's disobedience, and breach of the covenants, from which the commonwealth has its being. And whosoever thinking sovereign power too great, will seek to make it less, must subject himself to the power that can limit it, that is to say, to a greater.—*Ibid., Part II, Chap. XX.*

[9] **The Social Contract of Rousseau.**—But even more influential and radical was the political philosophy of Rousseau. Utterly ignorant of the facts given modern scholars by anthropology and comparative politics, in his political theories Rousseau was wholly at the mercy of classical antiquity and *a priori* theory. Never having seen a "natural" man, he constructed him as he saw fit. And the result was a savage who was also a saint, for "coming from the hand of the Author of all things, everything is good." His saintliness, indeed, vanished, but only

because he had become less a savage and had devised private property in land. Civilization was, therefore, a curse, and the wise man's ambition would be to free himself from its destructive influences.

This in the two Dijon essays. In the *Social Contract* he quite abandons this position, leaves his savages enjoying the thin air of theory, and seeks with sober sense to discover the real basis upon which the modern State may safely rest. His search is no longer for a "natural" man, but for practicable liberty and equality — the two virtues most prominent by their absence in the France of his day. Nor does he any longer regard private property in land as evil; it is rather assumed as a fundamental fact in society. Even his equality is equality before the law. But one thing he still holds: "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains." Freedom and equality were, he held, to be gained by the recognition of the - - purely imaginary — fact that the State is the outcome of a compact between men, in which each "places in common his person and his whole power under the supreme direction of the general will." This corporate body thus formed constituted the true sovereign. Each citizen is a member of the sovereign. The will of this sovereign people is not only absolute, it is, though not always wise, always right. It therefore must constitute the law, and if it allowed the king to reign, it would be only that he might prevent the clashing of individual interests. This is almost the only concession Rousseau makes to the actual facts of political history.

When he passes on to carry out this general political conception into actual life, his thought of necessity grew thoroughly *a priori*. "What is the government?" he asks. "An intermediate body established between the subjects and the sovereign for their mutual correspondence, charged with the execution of the laws and with the maintenance of liberty, both civil and political." As the sovereign and the subjects would be, according to his philosophy, the same people, government cannot be a distinct political entity. It is at this point the revolutionary implication is unavoidable. Strictly speaking, Rousseau recognizes no contract between subjects and rulers. The latter are simply

organs of the people itself, and may be dismissed at any moment. "It is contrary," says Rousseau, "to the nature of the body politic for the sovereign to impose upon itself a law which it can never change." Therefore — though Rousseau hardly dares put it quite so distinctly — therefore, a sovereign people may depose its servant king.

But it must be remembered that Rousseau cared nothing for what we call a republic. He seems even, sometimes, to prefer an elective aristocracy. But such an aristocracy would be only the servants of the people. Representative government he would not have; meetings should be held frequently, in which every citizen should vote on every question, for the "general will" alone is right. Further, by pushing his theory of the infallibility of majorities and the subsequent subjection of the individual to the community, Rousseau at the same time that he preached this absolute democracy, preached — although he denied it — a democratic despotism. "As nature gives each man," says he, "absolute power over his own limbs, so the social contract gives the body politic absolute power over its members and makes it the master of their possessions." There are to be, according to Rousseau, no checks upon this sovereign people except compulsory religion. The sovereign people should banish all those who say there is no salvation outside the Church and all those who say there is no God.

In the light of modern political history it is not difficult to see the weakness in this theory of Rousseau. There never was any such compact between men, and civilization is not a curse, but a perpetuation of what in the main must be regarded as blessings. Popular sovereignty as he conceived of it is a chimera and a seductive fallacy. His demand that all citizens should take part in all deliberations would result either, as Voltaire prophesied, in anarchy, or, as the Revolution demonstrated, in the tyranny of the mob and the club. His disregard of minorities and his relentless subjection of the individual to the sovereign is not liberty. Indeed, his entire philosophy logically would end not in liberty, but in equality under a new sort of despotism. But after all this is admitted, there remains one magnificent thought

—the rationality of society. And a rational society could be trusted to govern itself.

For a country in the condition of France this conception, if once universally joined with social discontent, meant reform or revolution. That he succeeded in getting this great principle diffused throughout France, and indeed in the works of others throughout the world, gave his great significance to Rousseau. But he has yet a more specific importance. Not only was he a philosophical leaven, but to many he was an all but inspired prophet. Men tried to put his entire political gospel into operation—and its evangelists were Robespierre and St. Just, and its millennium was the Terror.—"*The French Revolution*," *by Shailer Mathews.*

CHAPTER V

THE STATE AND THE GOVERNMENT

IN the first chapter reference was made to the distinction between the State and the Government. We are now in a condition to get a clearer idea of this distinction. The difference has been emphasized because of the coexistence of two contradictory theories of the State. When we use the word Government, from inveterate habit we give to it the Asiatic signification of repression and force. Several times in these lessons I have said that governing was only one of the functions of the State. In such statements I have had in view the Oriental idea of repression. Yet I have also used the word in an entirely different sense; I have made it include all sorts of state activity. Government is the only word in common use which expresses that idea. In this sense, the State *governs* in the maintenance of libraries as well as in the punishment of crimes. In this sense, *Government is the concrete embodiment and expression of the State.* It is the State in action.

(1) There are then two contradictory meanings to the word Government corresponding to the Western State and the Asiatic anti-State, respectively. In the anti-State, governing means the forcing of the people

to obey the ruler. In the democratic State it means the free and conscious activity of a self-conscious people. I have associated the anti-State with Asia because there it has found most perfect expression. The State, in the new sense, is only in process of attainment. In all actual States the two hostile principles are seeking expression.

(2) Soon after an anarchist had attempted the life of William I., Bismarck secured the passage of laws for putting down the socialist propaganda. Having secured the necessary votes, the Chancellor remarked, "Now for the pig-sticking."[1] In this remark Bismarck represented the anti-State of Germany. He exhibited a spirit which is inseparable from an attempt to govern by force. It is a spirit which in the West breeds revolution, assassination and anarchy; in the East it has tended to dehumanize a large part of the race. German citizens have been induced by this brutal challenge to vote in increasing numbers for socialist candidates. Not that they believe in socialism. But in this way they may offer most effective resistance to the destructive policy of their rulers. A London socialist said to me: "If we could but have two months of the German Emperor we would elect a socialist House of Commons." The fact that socialism in Germany grows under a policy of repression shows that the German people think more of their State than they do of their rulers.

(3) After the assassination of the Empress of Aus-

tria a consultation took place among the rulers of European States as to more effective methods for the suppression of anarchy. We can imagine that these rulers would look into the circumstances of the birth and education of the present known anarchists. It is said, of the one in question, that he was born in a brothel, exposed by his parents, brought up by cruel keepers, having received kindly treatment at the hands of no human being. In adult manhood his character was not lovely, and he fell an easy prey to revolutionary propaganda. Now, if the rulers of Europe should consult together and adopt effective means for securing to every subject born in their States his natural right to kind and loving nurture, they would be building their States upon sure foundations, and incidentally they would be putting down anarchy. If, on the other hand, they lay plans for the destruction of adult anarchists in the pig-sticking spirit of the German Chancellor then these rulers of Europe are themselves enemies of their States. They are themselves anarchists of a far more dangerous type than those whom they would destroy.

(4) The anti-State is founded upon the assumption that some men are born to exercise authority over other men. Governments have in the main been founded upon this principle. The natural effect of this principle is to destroy the moral basis of the State and to introduce universal anarchy. The natural tendency of governments has been to destroy the State. This ten-

dency has been resisted by organizations of men pitted against the government. The State has been preserved and gradually built up out of forces inherent in the people in opposition to the governments which have been bent upon their destruction. The State is founded upon the recognition of a moral law binding upon all the people. This law is not artificially and arbitrarily imposed; it is recognized as a fact of human nature. The attempt to govern men by force does violence to the primary and universal moral sense. In the Orient resistance to the threatened anarchy of force has taken the form of caste. In the West resistance has more and more taken the form of conscious and voluntary association.

(5) In 1888, I attended the funeral of John Mandeville at Mitchelstown, Ireland. Mandeville had been a political prisoner, and had died, as was alleged, from the effects of treatment received in prison. At that time Ireland was governed nominally by a strong Tory Ministry in England, which was pursuing a resolute policy of coercion. The Tory Ministry was supported by the active coöperation of the Pope of Rome, who had issued an order positively forbidding his Catholic subjects to engage in the "Boycott"[2] or the so-called "Plan of Campaign,"[3] which were the most effective weapons in the hands of the Irish National League for resistance to the English government. Ireland was really being governed by a voluntary association called a National League. It was already well understood

that the coercive policy was a failure. So said members of the army of occupation. So said the editor of a Tory paper in Ireland, who at the time was engaged in writing a history of the English occupation of Ireland. But could not the most powerful nation in the world bring into subjection a disarmed, poverty-stricken, and feeble folk? Let six hundred years of English effort to govern Ireland and the present (1912) policy of the Liberal government answer that question. England is to-day the most powerful government on earth because the government has at all times confronted unauthorized voluntary associations which would not be coerced. Democracy has come into the English Constitution by these unauthorized forces gaining control of, or becoming the Government. The Cabinet is itself an example of an unauthorized voluntary association which in course of time has gathered to itself the control of legislation and administration.

The modern State is strong according as it approaches the ideal of a voluntary association including all the people. It is weak and tends to anarchy according as the idea of repression by brute force lingers in the minds of citizens.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER V

The State and the Government

[1] **Anti-Socialistic Law.**—The anti Socialistic law being only enacted for a twelve months, was renewed in 1880, and again in 1884.

Finally in 1886 it was sought to make it permanent, but, although the bill, minus the clause giving power to expel the Socialists, was carried in the Reichstag by a majority of fifty-five, it was finally dropped by the Government (Jan., 1890) and the anti-Socialist law ceased to operate. The abandonment of coercion was followed by the fall of Bismarck (March 17, 1890), and then it became evident that the cause of both was an acute difference of opinion between the Emperor and his Chancellor as to the best method of dealing with Social Democracy.

The Emperor wished to try Richard Plantagenet's policy, when he met the revolted peasants of Essex and Kent with the brave words, "*I will be your leader.*"

Bismarck had already tried the experiment and was satisfied that "it was of no use, since God had not implanted in the workingman the faculty of contentment."

Besides, the wrath of the capitalists was a more serious thing for the State than the grumbles of the workingman.

* * * * * * * * *

However, William II. was not to be daunted. He not only proposed an international congress of labor, which assembled, and did good work, but he caused a Sunday bill to be brought into the Reichstag, securing to the workers, with some exceptions, Sunday rest for the whole twenty-four hours, besides six clear days holiday in the year.

The new imperial policy was to veil large and generous concessions under a guise of savage threats, uttered in a tone of relentless autocracy.

But the Social Democrats accepted the first as only the due of the people, and used the second as a means of obtaining further sympathy for their cause.

The concessions referred to were the act for the insurance of workingmen against old age and disablement from sickness or accident, by means of a combination of the workmen, the employer and the state.

This act has been a great success. Other acts for the protection of the lives and health of the working-classes, and for the regulation of the relations between journeymen, apprentices and their masters, followed. Since April, 1894, no children under thirteen can be employed in factories, and only above that age in cases where elementary education is not obligatory on the parents. Women cannot be made to work more than eleven hours a day nor for a month after giving birth to a child.

But the ameliorating effect of these concessions was destroyed and the Social Democratic movement stimulated by the splenetic speeches which the emperor thought fit to make about this time.

But his speech to the recruits of the Foot Guards at Potsdam outdid everything he had hitherto said in its almost brutal extravagance. "You have, my children, sworn allegiance to me. That means that you have given to me body and soul. You have only one enemy and that is my enemy. With the present Socialist agitation I may order you — which God forbid — to shoot down your relatives, your brothers, and even your parents, and then you must obey me without a murmur."—*"Annual Register," 1891, pp. 280-282.*

The answer to these imprudent attacks came in the form of a mute remonstrance on the part of the people, who gave a vote in 1893 for the Social Democrat program of no less than 1,786,-738 — more than seventeen times as numerous as that of 1871.

And thus William I., instead of effecting the end of suppressing the Social Democratic Agitation, very considerably stimu-

lated it, and impaired not a little his much prized prestige.—*Heath, in "Contemporary Review," Oct., 1891.*

Boycotting.—A boycott is a combination against a landlord, a tradesman, employer, or other person, to cease social or business relations with him, and to induce others to withhold having relations with him.

It is also used in agreements, not to use certain articles, or the articles of a certain manufacturer, on the ground that they have been produced in ways or under conditions condemned by the parties dictating the boycott.

The word is derived from the name of Captain Boycott (sometimes written Boycatt), who was, in 1880, living at Lough Mask House, County Mayo, Ireland, as land agent to Lord Erme, an Irish nobleman.

The population of the region for miles around resolved to have nothing to do with him, and as far as possible to prevent any one else from having anything to do with him. His life appeared to be in danger—he had to claim police protection. . . . To prevent civil war the authorities had to send a force of soldiers, and Captain Boycott's harvests were brought in, guarded always by the little army.

This proceeding was the origin of the word, and its origin has undoubtedly contributed to the prejudice which the court feels toward acts called by this name. The idea of the courts has uniformly been that the word implied lawless violence, or what led directly to it.—*Bliss, "Encyclopedia of Social Reform."*

The Plan of Campaign.—The Plan of Campaign in Ireland was organized in 1886, and was sustained and encouraged by the members of the National League, chiefly in the Luggacurren, Mitchelstown, Ponsonby, O'Grady, Brooke, and Leader estates.

In each case the tenants, after presenting their demands regarding a reduction of rent, the amount of back rent they are willing to pay, and other conditions, if they meet with a refusal, place the sum they consider due in a common purse, which is committed to the custody of a trustee, usually either a politician or a priest.

The trustee notifies his willingness to settle with the landlord on the terms that have been concerted, expressing the determination otherwise to use the fund in defending the tenants against eviction or vexatious legal proceedings and in support of the evicted.

The landlords formed a corporation, or league, for the purpose of combating the Plan of Campaign by advancing money to embarrassed landlords and working vacant farms from which the tenants have been evicted. They also organized a subsiding emergency committee, which undertook to furnish tenants or care-takers for evicted farms, and sheriff's deputies to enforce writs of ejectment. In some cases new tenants were imported from the Protestant districts."—*"Appleton's Cyclopedia Annual," 1888, Great Britain, p. 392.*

Capitols of the World

HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, THE HAGUE, HOLLAND

CHAPTER VI

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION

ABOVE all countries America is the home of government by voluntary association. Our Virginians came for the most part because they wanted to come. So long as there were attempts to govern them by repression there were rebellions and manifest tendencies to anarchy. Left to manage their affairs in their own way the colony became strong and prosperous. The town meeting organized on board the Mayflower is but a type of thousands of similar acts where a group of friends and neighbors have gone into the wilderness to plant a church, or have organized a new township, a school district, or a county. Americans have by conscious volition organized all their governments, local and general.[1]

(1) Voluntary movement has for the most part outrun formal legal authority. Iowa may be taken as a type of what has happened in many places. The State was founded by people who crossed the Mississippi in violation of law, adopted for themselves a system of local government, and took possession of the land yet unsurveyed by the Federal government. In each neighborhood minute regulations were adopted securing to each "settler" an equitable share of both wooded and

prairie lands. They created a system of registration and conveyance of titles to lands which still belonged to the United States government. When Congress threatened eviction the settlers threatened secession. In course of time all the property rights which had grown up under the voluntary associations were recognized as legal. This continent has been occupied and its governments organized by the free will of the people.

(2) The greatest strength and the greatest weakness of the American State comes from the training of the people in free and voluntary association.[2] The movement for Independence was strong according as it secured the free and voluntary support of the people of the Thirteen Colonies. During the War the Continental Congress was comparatively strong since the people gave it voluntary support. After the War it collapsed, disowned by the people. The new Constitution was the result of a voluntary movement among the citizens. The general government has been strong according as the conviction has prevailed that it is an organization for the better fulfillment of their wishes. It has been weak according as the conviction has prevailed that it represents coercion in all our school districts, townships, towns, cities, counties, States, as well as the general government. All effective strength rests upon the belief that the government is an agency for the accomplishment of desirable ends. The man who feels that he is a subject from compulsion is a

natural enemy to the government and is hence a source of weakness to it. The perfection of strength is reached when all the people have a supreme interest in the State with its various branches, as being the one Society which includes them all, and is capable of responding to every righteous demand.

(3) But in America, as perhaps in almost no other country, has government been weakened by voluntary associations which do not include all the people. Political parties are voluntary associations and one political party cannot include all the people.[3] It is possible, however, for the party system, as an agency for seeking a wise policy of government, to so represent the whole people, that all the people may be served and the State strengthened. But with the advent of the "Spoils System" into American politics, the party has tended to become an association of a few citizens who gain control of government and exercise its powers for the private gain of the few. Through the party machine which is inseparable from the spoils system in party politics, the people suffer at the hands of the few, and the government is correspondingly weakened.[4]

All except extreme anarchists concede that the police ought to be controlled by the one association including all the people. Yet in America a considerable part of the police business has gone into the hands of private associations. A government cannot allow the police business to drift out of its hands and still be in the true sense a government.

(4) I have already referred to the growth of private business corporations which encroach upon the field of government. Professor Jevons, in view of the many powers which in one way or another control us, refers to the "State as among the least of the powers to which we are subject." If this could be said in England it is even more applicable in America. Our State surely is complicated enough at best. We cannot permit private dominion to be added without its weakening the State.

Associations of employers of labor and the associations of laborers include only a minority of the people, yet they become organized and pitted against each other. These private organizations tend to usurp the powers of government and threaten the safety of the State. The industrial revolution involves increased power of association. This means increased power in the State. The State being the one association including all the people cannot safely permit itself to be over-shadowed by any minor association or group of associations.

Notwithstanding the well-known fact that our State is itself a product of voluntary association formed in comparatively recent times, yet, because we give to the agents of the State the name government, there is a strong race tendency in case of any apparent conflict between State and citizen or private association to side against the government. We still look upon the agents of this association into which we have solemnly entered as in a sense our enemy, as something to be dreaded.

When our legislatures meet we tremble; when they adjourn we breathe easier. So long as the people believe that their governments are dangerous, they are likely to be dangerous. It requires long and patient training to attain both the realization and the fact of a government of the people, by the people, for the people. The recent agitation in favor of the referendum, the initiative, and recall as well as the direct election of the Senate by popular vote may be considered a phase of this training.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER VI

Voluntary Association

"The True Degree of the State—that is, as we have shown [illegible] sentiment that creates a [illegible] where without this [illegible] mechanical union or com- [illegible] higher, more intimate, perma- [illegible] it is true that in [illegible] created out of a [illegible] of community [illegible] and this sentiment finds [illegible] power, and the subjec- [illegible]

[illegible] Jellinek, has put it, "The [illegible] of the State is the fact that an aggre- [illegible] feeling of its unity, and gives [illegible] organizing itself as a collective per- [illegible] as a volitional and active sub- [illegible] that this essential psychological [illegible] subjectively in the minds of the people, [illegible] in laws and political institutions. It [illegible] while this subjective element of unity is the [illegible] of the State, it alone is not sufficient to con- [illegible] a State.

The body politic cannot be said to be created until the desires that this feeling engenders have become outwardly [illegible] the erection of a common governing [illegible] favoring, or at least not hindering [illegible] will always follow the subjectiv[illegible] *the State," by Westel Woodb[illegible]*

The Nature of the State.—[illegible] made claim in the [illegible] to justify its existence as an infringement upon [illegible] natural freedom of the individual. [illegible] shows [illegible] to a condition in which [illegible] in which the individual is [illegible] by some power other than that [illegible] strength, is only possible in a political community. [illegible] there is a necessity to demonstrate the moral [illegible] to be, apart from, and in addition to the question whether it subserves the ends for which it was established, such a [illegible] existence may be said to [illegible] the consent of the people collectively expressed. [illegible] fact has should the entire community, or a dominant portion thereof, [illegible] civil control and to reestablish a regime of complete animality, it could do so.—*Ibid.*, p. [illegible]

Political Parties.—Political parties are formed in every legislative assembly among men of all [illegible] and all forms of executive authority. [illegible] set of measures carried and another group [illegible] will organize itself in order to give [illegible] its views. To any such organization a certain amount of party machinery is incident. [illegible] connection between the executive and the legislature [illegible] England in the eighteenth century [illegible] the Constitution today [illegible] peculiar [illegible] promote [illegible] government [illegible] the [illegible] with which it is identified [illegible]

[illegible] whatever merits it may have, is [illegible] and for the people. It [illegible] of the people and, primarily [illegible] section, if the voters who

form a certain party are men of liberal ideas and just principles, their leaders will of course not go so far to oppress the minority as they would if their constituents were narrow-minded and reckless of moral restraint.—*"The Relations Between Freedom and Responsibility in the Evolution of Democratic Government," by Arthur Twining Hadley, pp. 19-21.*

[4] **Community Effort.**—Man, as Aristotle has well said, is a political animal. His power of forming communities in which the individual shall be subordinated to the interests of the group, is one of his most distinctive qualities. His power of forming free communities, in which each individual shall by his own judgment direct his efforts to a public end, is a characteristic yet more distinctive; and this form of social organization gives him his greatest strength. But if self-government is not used enough to promote the resources of the community as a whole, but to divert those resources into individual channels, it becomes a source of weakness instead of strength whether that weakness come in the form of enervation, as in Greece and Italy, or of incapacity for discipline, as in Poland, or of ambition and misdirected organization, as in France under the old régime.—*Ibid, pp. 146-147.*

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW. PART VI

1. Why is man a political animal? What are the characteristics of the Asiatic State? Of the Western State? Are moral obligations equal? Why is there no common morality in Asia? What is caste?

2. Why has the West been progressive and the East non-progressive? Can there be democracy without a common recognition of a supreme moral law? Why does a belief in government by force tend to destroy government? Why are people prejudiced against government? Why do men fear majorities? What is the chief right of minorities?

3. What is the meaning of Laissez Faire? How did the term come to be applied to the State? How has the theory tended to weaken democracies? What is the most difficult business the State has attempted? How has Laissez Faire teaching been reinforced by private greed? Why have the Swiss escaped from organized private greed? Give illustrations of Swiss municipal enterprise.

4. Which comes earlier, individual or public consciousness? Why does individual consciousness introduce confusion in the State? Could modern democracy exist without the consciousness of the individual? Give Hobbes' contract theory of the State. Did Hobbes

admit that the State was at war with the individual? Is a government by force necessarily at war with the individual? What was the political creed of Rousseau?

5. What does government mean in the Asiatic Anti-State? In the Western democracy? Why has socialism increased in Germany? How could European rulers put down anarchy? How do they produce anarchy? In cases of attempts to govern by force do voluntary organizations of the people tend to preserve the State? Did the Irish League strengthen the English State? What were the chief provisions of the Anti-Socialistic Law of Germany? What was the "Plan of Campaign" in Ireland in 1886? What is the present political status of Ireland?

6. How was the American State formed? How does voluntary association strengthen the State? Do voluntary associations, including only a part of a people, tend to weaken a democracy? Why? What is the effect of the Spoils system? Of private police? Of monopolistic corporations?

SUBJECTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY

1. The slow growth of public opinion as a reaction against the unrighteousness of rulers.

2. Majorities and the substitutes for majorities in deciding questions of government.

3. The Laissez Faire theory in Economics and Politics.

4. Man versus the State. Ritchie's reply to Spencer.

5. The contract theory of the State, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau.

6. Voluntary association; in a Despotism and in a Democracy.

7. The workings of the referendum and recall in the United States.

PART VII

Education in the Democratic State

CHAPTER I

THE SPARTAN STATE

ALL governing is by means of education and training. In the anti-State education is based upon force. Such education tends to destroy certain faculties and to abnormally develop others. It tends to make of the subject a machine, and to render him a victim of superstition and erroneous beliefs. In the anti-State, governing involves lying and deception. In the true State education has a wholly different meaning. In the anti-State what we call education tends to destroy the characteristic qualities of man and reduce him to the condition of a brute. It is education in ignorance; a forced acceptance of error. The true State assumes that there is in human reason a natural preference for the truth; that in a free and unforced exercise of the faculties truth tends to prevail, that error requires the continued support of brute force; that the attempt to give to truth the support of brute force is a negation of reason, and results in the substitution of error. Truth cannot be maintained by an appeal to force; error can not be maintained in any other way. This is the funda-

mental distinction between the State and the anti-State; between a government based upon reason and a government based upon force. In the State, authority rests upon will and not upon force. Force may be used as a minor agency in the process of education, applied chiefly to the abnormal or rudimentary man.

(1) In the development of the modern State, Sparta holds an important place. It is the one Greek State which endured for many centuries with little change, and whose history has been fully written and widely read. Grote speaks of Lycurgus as "the founder of a warlike brotherhood, rather than the law-giver of a political community."[1] The State was emphatically a training school for all the citizens, men, women and children. The State became the foster parent of the infant, and from infancy to old age the citizen remained in the training-school of the brotherhood.

It should be understood that that which constituted the ideal Spartan State included only a small fraction of the people. The Perioeci, who held and worked a portion of the lands, were freemen, and at the same time the subjects of the Spartan State, while the Helots, who worked the estates of the Spartans, were slaves, and constituted the great body of the population. The Spartan State which has had such an influence upon state-building in Europe is the "brotherhood" itself, the subject peoples being only incidentally involved.

(2) It is difficult for the victim of Asiatic philosophy

to think of anything but force as prevailing in such a State as Sparta. But if we may trust the uniform testimony of historians, the government of the Spartan Brotherhood was founded upon something infinitely stronger and more enduring than brute force. The Spartan youth endured pain, and privation, and death, not from a fear of punishment, but because he felt himself to be a part of the Brotherhood. The Brotherhood commanded endurance, and every member of it was trained to express the common sentiment in his own life and conduct. Sparta endured with little change for five centuries, because for so long a time it maintained unbroken the spirit of the Brotherhood. There was no division, in the Aristotelian sense, into rulers and subjects. Every member of the Brotherhood was a ruler and every member was a subject. They had, it is true, their Senators, their two Kings, and their Ephors. But these were at all times individually and collectively subjects of the Spartan State. When in later and degenerate days, the officers of the Brotherhood ceased to be subjects, the State was at an end. The Spartans depended for security upon the will of the people. No true State can have any strength, any security, in any other way. The State was destroyed as soon as there was an attempt to govern Spartans by force. In all States in all lands the same tendency has been manifest. Force in government has tended to destroy the State.[2] The Spartans did not dare to build a wall around the city. They knew where their strength lay. Their

wall was composed of living men animated by a common spirit. Any other dependence would have been death to the State.

(3) Historians remark upon the long duration of the Spartan Constitution. The fact is the Spartans would not trust themselves to written laws. Grote states that all premeditated statutes were interdicted. "When disputes are to be settled or judicial interference is required, the magistrate is to decide from his own sense of equity; that the magistrate will not depart from the established customs and recognized purposes of the city, is presumed from the personal discipline which he and the select body to which he belongs have undergone." The laws of the State consisted only in custom and the "recognized purposes" of the Brotherhood. For the enforcement of these laws they depended entirely upon the training of the citizen.

But the Spartan Brotherhood was itself a ruler. It ruled over ten or twenty times its own number of people of the same race, part of them freemen, part of them slaves. Its success as a ruler is no less remarkable than its success as a self-governing Brotherhood.[8] The Spartan subjects, both slave and free, were spirited people. They had minds of their own. Naturally, it would seem, they were difficult to govern. It is well to recall here Sir Henry Maine's contention that monarchy is the easy and natural form for all government. Will any one mention an instance in history where so difficult a task in the ruling of subject peoples by a

monarchy has been crowned with success for so long a period? We have a right to assume that it was because the Brotherhood governed itself through education and discipline, that it was enabled for five hundred years to secure the hearty coöperation of its subjects. The training which the ruler received as a member of the Brotherhood fitted him to meet the varied needs of the subjects outside the association.

When the Spartans undertook to rule over peoples whom they had conquered they utterly failed. They could rule themselves and their immediate subjects through a self-imposed discipline. In defense of the State they were invincible. They could not impose their rule upon other States.

In its mere form of government Sparta was not democratic. It is usually described as an oligarchy. But we cannot too often remind ourselves that the modern democratic State is not a mere form of government. It may assume any form the people want. In the evolution of the modern State, Sparta holds an important place, because it is an early instance of the expression by the State of the common purposes of a Brotherhood. Greece is in a sense the birthplace of the European theory of government, and Sparta is the most conspicuous instance of a successful Grecian State.

SPARTA, GREECE, FROM THE THERAPNE

From an old print.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER I

The Spartan State

[1] **Laws and Discipline of Lycurgus.**—Lycurgus (or the individual to whom this system is owing, whoever he was) is the founder of a warlike brotherhood rather than the lawgiver of a political community; his brethren live together like bees in a hive (to borrow a simile from Plutarch), with all their feelings implicated in the commonwealth, and divorced from house and home. Far from contemplating the society as a whole, with its multifarious wants and liabilities, he interdicts beforehand, by one of the three primitive Rhetræ, all written laws, that is to say, all formal and premeditated enactments on any special subject. When disputes are to be settled or judicial interference is required, the magistrate is to decide from his own sense of equity; that the magistrate will not depart from the established customs and recognized purposes of the city, is presumed from the personal discipline which he and the select body to whom he belongs, have undergone.

It is this select body, maintained by the labor of others, over whom Lycurgus exclusively watches, with the provident eye of a trainer, for the purpose of disciplining them into a state of regimental preparation, single minded obedience, and bodily efficiency and endurance, so that they may be always fit and ready for defense, for conquest and for dominion.

The parallel of the Lycurgean institutions is to be found in the Republic of Plato, who approves the Spartan principle of select guardians carefully trained and administering the community at discretion; with this momentous difference indeed, that the Spartan character formed by Lycurgus is of a low type, rendered savage and fierce by exclusive and overdone bodily

discipline — destitute even of the elements of letters — immersed in their own narrow specialties, and taught to despise all that lay beyond — possessing all the qualities requisite to procure dominion, but none of those calculated to render dominion popular or salutary to the subject; while the habits and attributes of the guardians, as shadowed forth by Plato, are enlarged as well as philanthropic, qualifying them to govern for purposes protective, conciliatory and exalted.

Both Plato and Aristotle conceive as the perfection of society something of the Spartan type — a select body of equally privileged citizens, disengaged from industrious pursuits, and subjected to public and uniform training. Both admit (with Lycurgus) that the citizen belongs neither to himself nor to his family, but to his city; both at the same time note with regret, that the Spartan training was turned only to one portion of human virtue — that which is called forth in a state of war.— "*History of Greece,*" *by George Grote, Vol. II., pp. 189-191.*

[2] **Individuality.**—He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life for him, has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgment to foresee, activity to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold to his deliberate decision. And these qualities he requires and exercises exactly in proportion as the part of his conduct which he determines according to his own judgment and feelings is a large one.

It is possible that he might be guided in some good path, and kept out of harm's way, without any of these things. But what will be his comparative worth as a human being? It really is of importance, not only what men do, but also what manner of men they are that do it. Among the works of man, which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying, the first in importance surely is man himself.

Supposing it were possible to get houses built, corn grown, battles fought, causes tried, and even churches erected and prayers said, by machinery — by automatons in human form —

it would be a considerable loss to exchange for these automatons even the men and women who at present inhabit the more civilized parts of the world, and who assuredly are but starved specimens of what nature can and will produce.

Human nature is not a machine to be built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing.—*"On Liberty," by John Stuart Mill, pp. 113, 114.*

The Strength of Democratic Government.—By no one has the strength of democratic government in its representative form been so ably set forth as by John Stuart Mill, who defined it as that form in which "the whole people, or some numerous portion of them, exercise the governing power through deputies periodically elected by themselves." There is no difficulty in showing, he asserts, that the ideally best form of government is that in which the supreme controlling power in the last resort is vested in the entire aggregate of the community, every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that ultimate sovereignty, but at least occasionally called on to take an actual part in the government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general. The only government, he continues, which can fully satisfy the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate, and the degree of participation should everywhere be as great as the general degree of improvement of the community will allow, and ultimately all should be admitted to a share in the sovereign power of the state. So far as the welfare of the community is concerned the superiority of popular government, Mill goes on to say, rests upon two principles of as universal truth and applicability as any general proposition which can be laid down respecting human affairs.

The first is that the rights and interest of the individual can only be safeguarded when he is able to "stand up" for them himself; the second is that the general prosperity attains a higher degree and is more widely diffused in proportion to the amount and variety of the personal energies enlisted in promoting it.—*"Introduction to Political Science," by James Wilford Garner, p. 220.*

CHAPTER II

THE ATHENIANS

SPARTA was a State devoted to the narrow purpose of producing a perfect physical man adapted to the functions of war. It produced no artists of note, no poets, historians, or philosophers. It is Spartan history as seen through the eyes of Athenians that has tended mightily to give direction to the politics of modern Europe. The Athenians admired the Spartan State, and with Sparta as a model they sought to express the true philosophy of the State.

(1) Xenophon had good reason to admire Sparta. On a certain night, in the heart of Asia, a thousand miles from the sea, he found himself in company with ten thousand Greeks, mostly Spartans, surrounded by innumerable hosts of enemies, and with all the generals of the Greeks treacherously slain. Yet in those desperate straits, the Greeks having held an extemporized town meeting in the early morning, appointed new generals, organized a plan of campaign and accomplished the most remarkable retreat in all history. If the Ten Thousand Greeks had been victims of a government by force, they would have been as helpless as were the Asiatic soldiers. They had the discipline of the Brotherhood, and hence they were invincible. So

impressed was Xenophon with the superb training of the Spartans that he wrote a political novel in which he represented Cyrus the Great as being subjected to Spartan training, and by means of his *Cyropaedia* sought to teach his countrymen, the Athenians, how a statesman should be educated.

(2) Following the writings of Xenophon are the great works of Plato and Aristotle, who have ever since been teachers of the race. It is wide of the mark to suppose that these great philosophers followed in any narrow sense the teachings of Sparta. They had a minute knowledge of the structure of all the States of the period. Aristotle names more than a hundred whose constitutions he had carefully studied. Among them the Spartan State supplied the most abundant illustrative matter. Especially is it important, in that it furnished the model for a State founded upon the friendly coöperation of the citizens. But in the hands of the Athenian philosophers the scope of the Brotherhood is infinitely enlarged and aims at the perfection of man in his complete nature.

The Greeks saw distinctly the contrast between a despotic government and a true State. Aristotle says, "Many seem to think a despotic government is a political one, and what they would not allow to be just or proper if exercised over themselves, they will not blush to exercise over others; . . . But a despotic power is absurd, except only where Nature has framed the one party for dominion, the other for subordination."[1] A

truly political State, according to Aristotle, cannot be a despotic State. It is a society for the mutual exchange of services. In such a State there is no place for a conflict between the individual and the State. In the writings of both Aristotle and Plato, the State has a care even for the unborn child. It has a care for the training of the citizen from infancy to old age. Right conduct is secured by right education; not by pains and penalties.

Plato's *Republic* and Aristotle's *Treatise on Government* are treatises upon education quite as distinctively as upon politics. In the view of those authors, politics and education are one and the same. The State is the product of education. The business of the State is the training and the exercise of the citizens in the practice of virtue. Plato and Aristotle were both preachers of righteousness. They lived at a time when the glory was departing from their city. War and conquests were resulting in the formation of despotic government. They who had been free were becoming wonted to despotism. The philosophers, being also patriots, wished to point out a better way; to call attention to the one only way for the preservation of the State. That way was to preserve the Brotherhood and unite all classes by bonds of mutual service. "Our object in the construction of the State," says Plato, "is the greatest happiness of the whole, and not of any one class."

(3) But the Grecian States were not to be saved by

the "foolishness of preaching." Despotisms flourished, and the States became an easy prey to the Romans. There is reason to believe that Grecian learning had a salutary effect upon the Romans; that Roman politics were made more humane, more just, through Greek education. Grecian learning also profoundly affected the teachings of the Christian Church. It was, however, only at the end of the Middle Ages that the whole of European Christendom was baptized anew with Grecian learning. As stated in a former chapter, this was at a time when despotism in Church and State was being fastened upon the peoples of Europe. And then it was that sermons against despotic rule preached by Greek philosophers more than two thousand years earlier had great effect in arousing Europe to revolt.

Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* was written in 1515, soon after the discovery of the New World, and at the beginning of the Reformation. In this book we see heathen Greece in a supposed island in heathen America set to rebuke Christian Europe for its cruelty, injustice and tyranny. *Utopia* is a transcript of Plato's *Republic*, with many additions and variations. More did not admit slavery into his State, except in a limited way, and chiefly for disciplinary purposes. Utopia was a Brotherhood of all the people; no class was recognized as by nature rulers over other classes. The contrast between Utopia and the Greek State is most striking in the place given to war. In Utopia war is a dishonorable business.[2] It it became necessary for purposes

of defense, it was to be put into the hands of mercenaries, or those not yet trained to a high standard of morality. The Greeks were wanting as to any broad humanitarian spirit. *Utopia* on the contrary recognized a mission to the world. It proposed to conquer the world not by force but by moral and political training. It breathed the broad, catholic spirit of a "Parliament of Religions," and a "Federation of Man."

(4) Sir Thomas More and the Greeks were at one in that they founded the State upon the will of a people who recognized no man as master. They are alike in that they repudiated force as the foundation of the State, and in its stead placed moral and religious training. Aristotle had much to say about the government of slaves; yet he distinguishes sharply the relation of the slave to the master, from the relation of the citizen to the powers that be in the State. In the State there is no yielding to force: there is yielding only to reason.[3] A despotic State he called an absurdity.

It should be noticed that what the Greeks called the the State (πόλις), or city, was composed chiefly of the select body formed into a brotherhood. This might take organic form either as monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy. Whatever the form it continued to be a brotherhood. As soon as it became a despotism, the State was destroyed. Yet this Brotherhood held subject peoples, both slaves and freemen. In More's Utopia the brotherhood is expanded so as to include all the people. The State among the Greeks was a rul-

CONSTITUTION SQUARE, ATHENS, GREECE

ing body. It corresponds more nearly to what we should call the government. But viewed as a government it was despotic. That is, it exercised authority over subjects. It imposed its own authority.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER II

The Athenians

[1] **The Ethics of Government.**—Among the Iberians, a warlike nation, they fixed as many columns upon a man's tomb as he had slain enemies; and among different nations different things of this sort prevail, some of them established by laws, others by custom. Probably it may seem too absurd to those who are willing to take this subject into their consideration, to inquire whether it is the business of a legislator to be able to point out by what means a State may govern and tyrannize over its neighbors, whether they will or not; for how can that belong either to the politician or legislator which is unlawful? For that cannot be lawful which is done not only justly, but unjustly also; for a conquest may be unjustly made. But we see nothing of this in the arts, for it is in the business neither of the physician nor the pilot to use either persuasion or force, the one to his patients, the other to his passengers; and yet many seem to think a despotic government is a political one, and what they would not allow to be just or proper if exercised over themselves, they will not blush to exercise over others; for they endeavor to be wisely governed themselves, but think it of no consequence whether others are so or not. But a despotic power is absurd, except only when nature has framed the one party for dominion, the other for subordination; and therefore no one ought to assume it over all in general, but those only which are the proper objects thereof, thus no one should hunt men either for food or sacrifice, but what is fit for those purposes, and these are wild animals which are eatable.—"*Aristotle on Government,*" *Morley's Universal Library, Book VII, Chap. XI, p. 231.*

Utopian Idea of War.—They detest war as a very brutal thing; and which, to the reproach of human nature, is more practised by men than by any sort of beasts. They, in opposition to the sentiments of almost all other nations, think that there is nothing more inglorious than the glory that is gained by war. And therefore though they accustom themselves daily to military exercises and the discipline of war, in which not only their men but their women likewise are trained up, that in cases of necessity they might not be quite useless; yet they do not rashly engage in war, unless it be either to defend themselves, or their friends, from any unjust aggressors; or out of good nature or in compassion assist an oppressed nation in shaking off the yoke of tyranny. They indeed help their friends, not only in defensive, but also in offensive wars, but they never do that unless they had been consulted before the breach was made, and being satisfied with the grounds on which they went, they had found that all demands of reparation were rejected, so that a war was unavoidable.

* * * * * * * *

They would be both troubled and ashamed of a bloody victory over their enemies, and think it would be as foolish a purchase as to buy the most valuable goods at too high a rate, and in no victory do they glory so much as in that which is gained by dexterity and good conduct, without bloodshed. In such cases they appoint public triumphs, and erect trophies to the honor of those who have succeeded, for then do they reckon that a man act suitably to his nature when he conquers his enemy in such a way as that no other creature but a man could be capable of, and that is by the strength of his understanding. Bears, lions, boars, wolves, and dogs, and all other animals employ their bodily force one against another, in which as many of them are superior to men, both in strength and fierceness, so they are all subdued by his reason and understanding.

The only design of the Utopians in war is to obtain that by force, which if it had been granted them in time would have prevented the war, or if that cannot be done, to take so severe a revenge on those that have injured them that they may be terri-

fied from doing the like for the time to come. By these ends they measure all their designs, and manage them so that it is visible that the appetite of fame or vain-glory does not work so much on them as a just care of their own security.—*From More's "Utopia" in "Ideal Commonwealths," pp. 138, 140, 141.*

[8] **Relations of Governors to People.**—As every political community consists of those who govern and of those who are governed, let us consider whether during the continuance of their lives they ought to be the same persons or different; for it is evident that the mode of education should be adapted to this distinction. Now if one man differed from another as much as we believe the gods and heroes differed from men; in the first place, being far their superiors in body; and, secondly, in the soul, so that the superiority of the governors over the governed might be evident beyond a doubt; it is certain that it would be better for the one always to govern, the other always to be governed; but as this is not easy to obtain, and kings are not so superior to those they govern, as Zeylax informs us they are in India, it is evident that for many reasons it is necessary that all in their turns should both govern and be governed; for it is just that those who are equal should have everything alike, and it is difficult for a State to continue which is founded in injustice; for all those in the country who are desirous of innovation, will apply themselves to those who are under the government of the rest, and it will be impossible for the magistrates to get the better of them.—*"Aristotle on Government," Morley's Universal Library, Book VII, Chap. XIV, pp. 255-256.*

CHAPTER III

THE HEBREWS

FEW persons read Aristotle or Plato; few read *Utopia.* These works have affected the thinking of the many through the interpretations of the few. The Greeks have made an impression upon the modern State through their influence upon the minds of statesmen and philosophers. But the Hebrews produced a book whose influence has been most conspicuous upon the minds of the common people. Statesmen and philosophers have been guided and controlled by what the common people have read out of the Bible.

(1) The book has gone or is going into every tongue and language. If a language finds expression in books at all, one of them is sure to be the Bible. In the case of many tongues, the Bible is almost the only book which gives them expression. Languages have been reduced to writing for the express purpose of teaching the Scriptures.[1] The Bible is not simply a book; it is a cosmopolitan institution. It is the one agency which enables the highest and the lowest of the race to read each other's thoughts and to recognize a common moral obligation. When Stanley was sojourning with a friendly chief in the heart of the Dark Continent he desired to do something which

should cause his dusky friend to feel that he was a part of the common brotherhood of the race. So he translated for him as best he could a portion of the Bible.[2] What better could he do?

The Bible is not a book for a race, or a sect, or a religion. It is a book for all races, sects, and religions. It reveals and exemplifies the principles of universal morality adapted to man. It reveals and exemplifies the principles of moral progress. The God of the Bible is on the side of the poor, the weak, the unfortunate, the victims of tyranny and injustice. He is against the man who would use the accident of superior strength, or craft, or knowledge, for the sake of self-aggrandizement at the expense of his fellow-men. The theme of Plato and Aristotle is justice, or righteousness. The theme of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is the same. But, unlike the Greeks, the writers of the Hebrew book look upon the human family as a unit. Abraham was called in order that he might bless all the nations and all the families of earth. The Bible point of view is that of universal history growing out of universal morality. There is one Lawgiver, one Law, expressed by one word, Love. And the whole of history, the whole of moral progress, consists in learning the meaning of this word, and expressing it in a righteous society.

(2) The teachings of the Bible are the most considerable factor in the building of the Western State. Greek philosophy proceeds from the few to the many.

In this it is Oriental in its ultimate tendencies. The effective teaching of the New Testament proceeds from the many to the few. In this it has ever been preparing the way for the foundation of a State based upon universal brotherhood. "The common people heard him gladly." We have the authority of the one learned apostle for saying, "that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty were chosen." God rather chose the weak to bring to naught the devices of the mighty. Green calls our attention to the fact that when the Normans conquered England and proposed to force the French language upon the English, they filled all the high offices in church and state with foreigners. There followed a revival of religion among the English people. The lower clergy were English. By the very fact of foreign rule they were driven into closer alliance with the common English people. By the power of religious teaching addressed to the common people they saved their language along with their local institutions, and in course of time the people conquered their Norman conquerors. Without this triumph there would have been no English and American States, such as we know.

The Friars' revival in the century following the Norman Conquest began among the lowest classes of the people, and later it gave new life to the universities. The Lollard movement in the fourteenth century was a political and religious revival among the peasants. Wyclif gave to the people the Bible in their own

tongue, and, notwithstanding brutal repression for more than a hundred years, this Biblical teaching was kept alive among the people and prepared the English for the Reformation. Before the days of printing, the Scriptures were made familiar to the masses of the people by means of the drama—that is, by the mysteries, or miracle plays of the middle ages.

It was after more than a hundred years of printing, and after multitudes had learned to read, that England, as Green tells us, had become "the people of a book."[3] The Puritan movement included all classes, high and low; yet the root ideas of the modern State, Toleration and Democracy, found their clearest and most effective expression among the common people. The modern State can never be understood by one who does not clearly perceive that the great ideas of law and order, and morality, and religion, have first found social expression among the common people, and then have been gradually extended to those in places of power and privilege.[4] It is this which Mr. Gladstone had in view when he said the masses have been right, and the classes wrong.

Capitols of the World

PARK ROYALE AND APPROACH TO PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER III

The Hebrews

[1] **Various Translations of the Bible.**—Science and civilization on the soil of India and elsewhere are greatly indebted to the missionaries who have achieved important philological triumphs in reducing many of the savage dialects for the first time to grammar, and thus preparing the way for intellectual culture as well as ethics.

Translations have been made, either of the entire Bible or portions of it, into about three hundred and fifty different languages and dialects.

The American Bible Society alone has aided in the translation, printing, or distribution of the Scriptures in the following languages and dialects—ninety-five in all: Hebrew, Greek, English, Gaelic, Irish, Welsh, French, Spanish, Hebrew-Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Hebrew-German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, Latin, modern Greek, Albanian, Roumanian, Servian, Bulgarian, Slavonic, Russian, and Reval-Esthonian; Turkish, Osmanli-Turkish, Græco-Turkish, Armeno-Turkish, Ancient Armenian, Modern Armenian, Koordish, Azerbijan, Arabic, Ancient Syriac, Modern Syriac, Persian, Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Telugu, Canarese, Tamil, Marathi, Pahari, Kumaoni, Gurmukhi, Siamese, Laos, Mongolian, Burmese, Chinese (Classical), Easy Wenli, Chinese (Mandarin), the Foochow, Swatow, Shanghai, Soochow, Canton, Ningpo, and Amoy Colloquials, Japanese, Japanese (Kunten), and Corean; Hawaiian, Ebon (Marshall Islands), Gilbert Islands, Kusaien, Ponape, Mortlock, and Ruk; Dakota, Muskokee (Creek), Choctaw, Cherokee, Mohawk, Seneca, Ojibwa, Delaware, and Nez Perces; Zulu, Benga, Grebo, Mpongwe, Dikela, Tonga, Umbundu, and Sheetswa; Creolese, Arrawack, and Aymara.

The circulation of the Scriptures is now more or less free in all parts of Europe. In Asia the book has obtained entrance to the Turkish Empire and Persia, while India, China, Siam and Japan have been benefited thereby. Africa, north, south, east and west (including Egypt), has been partially reached, while in Central America, South America, and many of the South Sea Islands the circulation is increasing.

[2] **Translation.**—This little incident, trivial as it may appear, had very interesting results. Encyclopædic talk was forgotten in the grander and more sublime themes which Scripture and divinity contributed. The emperor cast covetous eyes on the Bible and my Church of England Prayer Book, and perceiving his wish, I introduced to him a boy named Dallington, a pupil of the Universities Mission at Zanzibar, who could translate the Bible into Kiswahili for him, and otherwise communicate to him what I wished to say.

Henceforth, during the intervals of leisure that the war gave us, we were to be seen—the king, court, Dallington, and I—engaged in the translation of an abstract of the Holy Scriptures. There were readers enough of these translations, but Mtesa himself was an assiduous and earnest student.

Having abundance of writing paper with me, I made a large book for him, into which the translations were fairly copied by a writer called Idi. When completed, Mtesa possessed an abridged Protestant Bible in Kiswahili, embracing all the principal events from the Creation to the Crucifixion of Christ. St. Luke's Gospel was translated entire, as giving a more complete history of the Saviour's life.

When the abridged Bible was completed, Mtesa called all his chiefs together, as well as the officers of his guard, and when all were assembled he began to state that when he succeeded his father he was a Mshensi (a heathen), and delighted in shedding blood, because he knew no better, and was only following the customs of his fathers.—*"Through the Dark Continent," by Henry M. Stanley, p. 322.*

[3] **Puritan England.**—No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which

parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament.

England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at churches and read at home, and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened, kindled a startling enthusiasm.

When Bishop Bonner set up the first six Bibles in St. Paul's "many well-disposed people used much to resort to the hearing thereof, especially when they could get any that had an audible voice to read to them." . . . "One John Porter used sometimes to be occupied in that goodly exercise, to the edifying of himself as well as others. This Porter was a fresh young man and of a big stature; and great multitudes would resort thither to hear him, because he could read well and had an audible voice." But the "goodly exercise" of readers such as Porter was soon superseded by the continued recitation of both Old Testament and New in the public services of the church; while the small Geneva Bibles carried the Scriptures into every home.

The popularity of the Bible was owing to other causes besides that of religion. The whole prose literature of England, save the forgotten tracts of Wyclif, has grown up since the translation of the Scriptures by Tyndale and Coverdale. So far as the nation at large was concerned, no history, no romance, hardly any poetry, save the little known verse of Chaucer, existed in the English tongue when the Bible was ordered to be set up in churches.

Sunday after Sunday, day after day, the crowds that gathered round Bonner's Bibles in the nave of St. Paul's, or the family group that hung on the words of the Geneva Bible in the devotional exercises at home, were leavened with a new literature. Legend and annal, war song and psalm, state-roll and biography, the mighty voices of prophets, the parables of evangelists, stories of mission journeys, of perils by the sea and among the heathen, philosophic arguments, apocalyptic visions, all were flung broadcast over minds unoccupied for the most part by any rival learning.

The disclosure of the stores of Greek literature had wrought the revolution of the Renaissance. The disclosure of the older mass of Hebrew literature wrought the revolution of the Reformation. But the one revolution was far deeper and wider in its effects than the other. No version could transfer to another tongue the peculiar charm of language which gave their value to the authors of Greece and Rome.

Classical letters, therefore, remained in the possession of the learned, that is, of the few; and among these, with the exception of Colet and More, or of the pedants who revived a pagan worship in the gardens of the Florentine Academy, their direct influence was purely intellectual.

But the tongue of the Hebrew, the idiom of the Hellenistic Greek, lent themselves with a curious felicity to the purposes of translation. As a mere literary monument, the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue. —"A Short History of the English People," by John Richard Green, pp. 460, 461.

4 Religious Beliefs as a Unifying Force.—We have seen that the most important problem which confronts society is how to hold together. It seems to us who have never known life outside of society that we naturally gravitate together. As a matter of fact men naturally gravitate apart and are at last bound permanently together only after endless failures to make fast the bonds of sympathy. The anti-social forces in human life, the clash of opposing interests, and the collisions even between unharmonized efforts of kindness are ever threatening the social peace. And the very development of society, bringing with it diversities and widely sundered classes, adds to the disruptive forces which are ever tugging at the bonds that hold us together.

Every social development is, therefore, primarily a development of unifying forces. These forces, if they are to be permanent, must rest on common interests, and end in common feelings. There must be many things about which men think alike and which appeal strongly to their feelings if they are to cling together in spite of mutual wrongs and misunderstandings.

It may seem at first that the general fact of society itself would furnish a sufficient basis for these common beliefs and feelings, that all can see that society is a blessing and feel like preserving it at any cost to their lesser personal interests. Unfortunately this is far from being the case. The majority of men do not even know that there is any such thing as society, being conscious only of the existence of other men whose occasional interference with their will is far more present to their thoughts than the fundamental benefits derived from their co-operation. Even of the few who realize that there is such a thing as society only a very few appreciate its importance and see in it an object of love and reverence. Only in a very advanced stage of social development can society as such be the rallying point for social unity in belief and sentiment.

Religious belief is in its nature peculiarly fitted to serve as such a unifying force. In the first place there is a degree of uniformity in the belief itself from necessity, as a result both of its origin and its development. Whatever may be the origin of religious belief, whether in experience or in revelation, the presumption is very great that a certain unity will characterize it in its original form. It can hardly be supposed that conflicting revelations should emanate from a single source, or that persons similarly situated should draw from their experience conflicting conclusions. Minor differences there may be and that increasingly as ideas develop and individual caprice comes more fully into play, but underneath it all we ought to find a substantial unity. And this we find in all primitive religions and in the relics of primitivism in those that are more developed.

This primary unity, however, is vastly increased by the moulding influence of society as it reacts upon these primary beliefs. We have said that religions become more diverse as they develop, but this is only because societies are diverse and each tends to develop a religion after its own type. But within a given society there are powerful influences at work tending to unify opinions, especially during the earlier period of social development. These may mostly be summed up under the head of suggestion enforced by fear. In its simplest form this acts simply as an

interchange of impressions. Men see visions and dream dreams and tell their experiences and their theories about them. The more vivid impressions become common, the more plausible theories prevail. A powerful mind gifted with unusual perception or imagination and a rare magnetism may acquire complete ascendency over whole communities or societies. But whether through rare or commonplace personalities, the unifying influence of suggestion works on.

A belief thus unified and elaborated is transmitted by a higher form of suggestion known as tradition. The individual is born into an environment so saturated with the prevailing belief that he absorbs it as he learns to breathe. The Buddhist, or Mohammedan, regarding his religion as a part of the constitution of the universe, is quite unable to distinguish between the ideas derived from tradition and the evidence of his senses.

To this unity, which religious beliefs everywhere tend to acquire, is added the fact that they appeal powerfully to the feelings of men. Mere agreement does not unite men unless it be agreement about matters of supreme concern. We can understand how agreement in religious belief may become the nearest of all kinships and disagreement the most insuperable of all barriers.

Thus while sociology cannot concern itself with the spirit world or the eternal destiny of man as such, there are few questions that concern it more deeply than man's agreements regarding these same things. For sociology is interested primarily in the agreements and disagreements of men.—*From "Sociology," by H. H. Powers, p. 524.*

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW EDUCATION

WHAT we now know as the modern State could not have come into existence without the invention of printing and the manufacture of paper. Luther's Bible could not have been so potent in the creation of a uniform German language, and a German system of general education, without these material aids to spiritual forces.[1] The printed page enabled the millions to think and act together in ways otherwise impossible. Yet there had been three hundred years of printing and the peoples of Europe were apparently as completely and hopelessly in the hands of cruel and despotic power as ever. Only in America, where there was unlimited access to God's free acres, was the outlook more hopeful. The ruling classes of Europe still looked upon education and government as something to be imposed upon the people. They were still Asiatic in their modes of thinking. The people with their new aids went on thinking with such light as they could command. The French Revolution was the natural conclusion. We date the beginning of modern pedagogy from about the time of the French Revolution, and the coincidence is not accidental.

(1) About twenty years before the breaking out of the Revolution, in a letter to a woman of wealth in which he asked her to become his wife, Pestalozzi said: "Great and holy simplicity shall reign in my house. One thing more, my life will not pass without great and important undertakings, when the good of my country demands it. My whole heart belongs to it, and I shall risk everything to mitigate the misery and need of my countrymen. . . . Reflect well and decide whether you can give your heart to a man with these qualities, and in this condition, and be happy."[2] In this resolve Pestalozzi did not differ from thousands of Hebrew prophets and Christian teachers who had gone before. Like his predecessors, he set himself to the task of uprooting injustice and establishing a righteous State. In the thirty years following his marriage, in 1769, he had spent his wife's fortune in what appeared to be the vain attempt to institute reforms. At first he addressed himself to adults, and finding the task apparently hopeless, he turned to the child. His first great success came to him in the midst of the desolation following the Revolution. When the French armies overran Switzerland, in 1789, multitudes of children whose parents had been slain were left to starve. A company of these Pestalozzi gathered into a school at Stanz in the Canton of Unterwalden.[3] In this school principles of the new and righteous State gained objective expression and illustration. It was a brotherhood of the humblest and the most help-

less, and he who was in the place of master was the willing servant and friend of all.

(2) The new education has been variously defined and described. It is the progressive discovery of the child. It is a reverent treatment of human nature. The new education is all that Asiatic education is not. Asiatic education would seize upon the rudimentary man and distort his nature into some unnatural shape. The old education teaches by authority. It would impose beliefs by brute force. The new education, on the other hand, recognizes in the child and in the unspoiled human being, a natural disposition to believe the truth. It seeks in all ways to preserve and cultivate this disposition. Biber says of Pestalozzi that he led his pupils gradually to the discovery of truths which they could never forget. "Instead of building up a dead mind and a dead heart on the ground of a dead letter, he drew forth life to the mind, and life to the heart, from the fountain of life within, and thus established a new art of education, in which to follow him requires, on the part of the teacher, not a change of system, but a change of state." "He directed his whole attention to those natural elements which are found in the mind of every child."*

(3) Like the Greeks, the promoters of the new education proposed to found a just state upon the education and training of youth. Unlike the Greeks, they included all classes of the people as members of

* Krüsi's *Pestalozzi*, p. 34.

the common brotherhood. The Spartan brotherhood was composed of the few who trained themselves to exercise authority over the many. Spartan education did not have a reverent regard for human nature. It was an education which was, in part, imposed upon the helpless child. The product was abnormal. The higher nature of the Spartan was sacrificed to the demands of a ruling class. The Athenians certainly had higher and more nearly correct ideals of education. Yet because the Greek mind was dominated by the Asiatic idea of ruling classes, their methods in education were, in the main, Oriental. In the mind of even the best of the Greeks, justice was something to be gotten into the mind of the child rather than something to be discovered and cultivated. He would rely upon mechanical devices for guarding the youth from error. He would use the rod freely to teach the boy justice. In Xenophon's school, when the boy failed to give a just decision in the case of the large boy who had deprived the small one of his coat, the pedagogue flogged him severely. Xenophon knew no better way of getting a sense of justice into a boy's mind than through the posterior nerves. The modern teacher has discovered the boy's eyes; he has discovered that there is a sense of touch which is unaccompanied by pain, as well as the senses of taste and smell which may even be exercised with pleasure. But these are only preliminary to the far greater discovery that the unspoiled human being has by nature a love

of truth, a sense of proportion, a sense of justice, far more precious than any crude substitute which can be gotten into the mind by force or by any other artificial process. The new education aims at the progressive discovery of all native powers and their harmonious development. As a recent writer has expressed it, education consists in keeping out of the way of the pupil. The teacher is a friend, a discoverer, and a co-laborer. He is less and less a master to impose or to distort.

The principles of the new education first found social expression among the children of outcasts and beggars,[4] and for a hundred years they have been gradually making their way to the schools of all classes, to the college, and to the university.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER IV

The New Education

[1] **Luther's Bible.**—On Luther's return from Worms, he was by order of his friend, the Elector of Saxony, ostensibly taken prisoner and conveyed to the Wartburg, where he remained in disguise the following ten months. During this time he translated the New Testament into German and had it completed in March of 1522. He soon after began the translation of the Old Testament, and his translation of the whole Bible was completed in 1532 and published the following year. Luther is to be regarded as the founder of the present literary language of Germany — that is, of the New High German. He himself claims his language to be that of Saxon Chancery. This is, however, not the language of the court, but of the people, and much of the vocabulary of the Bible translation has been drawn from Low German as well as from High German sources. In this sense he is, as he is frequently asserted to be, the real creator of the present language. The Bible translation permanently established the literary language of Germany.

[2] **Pestalozzi's Letter.**—"Of my great and very reprehensible negligence in matters of etiquette and conventionality, it is useless to speak, as it is too obvious. I am further bound to confess, that I shall place the duties toward my fatherland in advance of those to my wife, and that, although I mean to be a tender husband, I shall be inexorable even to the tears of my wife, if they should ever try to detain me from performing my duties as citizen, to their fullest extent. My wife shall be the confidant of my heart, the partner of all my most secret counsel. A great and holy simplicity shall reign in my house. One thing more, my life will not pass without great and im-

portant undertakings. I shall never refrain from speaking, when the good of my country demands it. My whole heart belongs to it, and I shall risk everything to mitigate the misery and need of my countrymen.

* * * * * * * *

"Reflect well, and decide whether you can give your heart to a man with these qualities, and in this condition, and be happy.

"My dear friend, I love you so tenderly and fervently that this confession has cost me much, since it may even take from me the hope of winning you. My conscience would have called me a traitor, not a lover, if I had withheld from you any fact that might cause you future anxiety, or render you miserable. I now rejoice at what I have done. If the circumstances in which my duty and my country may place me hereafter, should make an end to my yearnings and hopes, I shall be conscious at least of not having been treacherous--of not having attempted to please you by assumed virtue. I have deceived you with no chimerical hopes of a happiness that is not to be expected; I have concealed from you no danger and no sorrow for the future; I have no cause for self reproach."

The lady was worthy of his confidence. Although the candid confessions of the faults of her lover presented but a thorny prospect of life, they could not shake her belief in his disinterested love and integrity of character. They were united in the year 1769, Pestalozzi being then in his twenty fourth year.

With the noble and intelligent lady, who shared with him her ample property, he might have lived in comparative ease and comfort, had he thought only of his own interests. But having the weakness of considering all the suffering members of the human race as belonging to his own family, it may be presumed that his life at Neuhof did not pass without dark and bitter experiences.—"*Life of Pestalozzi*," *Part I, pp. 18, 19.*

Life at Stanz.—Pestalozzi's resolution to go to Stanz seems to have been one of those inspired acts which are not weighed in the scale of reason. The inhabitants of the town were governed by priests, from whom little help and sympathy could be expected. Add to this the general devastation of the

country, the want of food, shelter, and other necessaries of life, the absence of school furniture and apparatus, and the reader can judge whether it offered many inducements to a man fifty-three years of age, of frail physical constitution, and weary from disappointment and care. The saying of a philosopher, that "great ideas spring from the heart," was applicable to him. It was love that urged him to ponder over the means of helping his poorer brethren; love that enabled him to persevere in his efforts under the most perplexing difficulties. When speaking of his resolution, he says: "I knew not exactly what I could accomplish, but I knew what I wished — to die or carry out my plans."

* * * * * * * *

The government assigned him for his school an empty convent, in which some alterations were indispensable. When it became known that the convent was open, even before the kitchen, school and bedrooms were completed, poor orphan children flocked thither in large numbers. The appearance of these ragged, neglected little ones would have been revolting to almost any other man; but Pestalozzi saw before him immortal souls which he might save from the sloth of mental and moral perdition. Assisted by his housekeeper, he wisely began his task by inculcating the necessity of cleanliness and order. He then commenced his educational work with an amount of vigor, self-forgetfulness, and enthusiasm, such as the world has seldom seen combined in the soul of one frail mortal.

The government of the school, even when punishment was necessary, was chiefly based on love and the power of good example. His own touching account gives the best idea of this: "I was among them from morning till evening. Everything tending to benefit body and soul, I administered with my own hand. Every assistance, every lesson they received, came from me. My hand was joined to theirs, and my smile accompanied theirs. They seemed out of the world and away from Stanz; they were with me and I with them. We shared food and drink. I had no household, no friends, no servants around me; I had only them. Was their health good, I enjoyed it with them;

were they sick, I stood at their side, I slept in their midst. I was the last to go to bed and the first to rise. I prayed with them, and taught them in bed till they fell asleep."—*Ibid.*, *pp.* *30, 31.*

[4] **Discouragements.**—In many respects his experience here was a repetition of that at Neuhof, where he had to deal with the very lowest classes of the community. To show the trials to which he was subjected, and the patience and forbearance which he was obliged to exercise continually, we will quote his own words: "Mothers who supported themselves by open beggary, would, upon visiting the establishment, find some cause of discontent, and take their children away, because 'they would not be worse off at home.' Sundays especially, fathers, mothers, and other relatives came to the house, and, taking their children aside in some corner or in the street, elicited complaints of every kind, and either took them away or left them peevish and discontented. Many were brought to the asylum with no intention but to have them clothed; which being done, they were removed without any apparent reason.

"Others required pay for leaving their children, in order to compensate for the diminished produce of their beggary. Others bargained for how many days in the week they could take them out for begging errands. Such proposals being rejected, they went away indignant, declaring that unless their terms were accepted they would soon take away their children. Several months passed in this constant fluctuation of pupils."—*Ibid.*, *p.* *35.*

CHAPTER V

THE TRIUMPH OF SCIENCE

IN a sense the new education grew out of the various popular movements to withstand and resist tyranny and oppression which had been kept up for thousands of years. It was, in a sense, a part of the same movement which resulted in the French Revolution. It is thus a result of the movements which have been all the time making for the modern democratic State. It is an effect of democratic tendencies. But the more important thing to understand about the new education is its relations to present and prospective democratic triumphs. The new discoveries in education, while growing out of the past, are at the same time important causes of rapid progress towards freedom in all the States.

(1) The age of democracy has also been the age of the triumph of science. For centuries teaching by authority and brute force had been arrayed against scientific teaching. Despotic government cannot allow its teachings to be questioned. If the rulers teach error, the error must be accepted as true. The influential subject must believe, or profess to believe, or he must die. The fundamental principles of despotism require this. In no other way can a despotism be

Capitols of the World

HALL OF AMBASSADORS, ROYAL PALACE, MADRID, SPAIN

maintained. After the New World had been discovered, especially after it had been circumnavigated, it became more and more inconvenient to destroy men for professing to believe that the world moves. Along with the Reformation and the wars and controversies following, the men of science made great gains. The Puritan century in England was also a scientific century, as compared with former times.

In its origin, science was favorable to toleration. The men of science naturally objected to being imprisoned and destroyed for the publication of their opinions. Undoubtedly the progress of science constituted a favoring condition for the success of the new education. But the founders of the new education were not primarily men of science. On the contrary, they were religious and moral enthusiasts. For moral reasons they appealed to nature. Above all things, the new teachers would preserve the truth-loving and truth-telling spirit found in the child. Objects in nature furnished the most convenient means for cultivating this spirit. It was as religious enthusiasts that they sought to turn the minds of youth away from the teachings of the day, upon which the unjust and tyrannical State was founded, and to preserve and cultivate a love of truth. What we know as the triumph of science in the middle of the present century was a direct result of the new religion. The love of truth, for the sake of all truth, became in the minds

of many a sort of all-sufficient religion. Without the new religion instilled into the minds of several generations of youth, the doctrine of evolution would not so suddenly have captured the intellect of the civilized world. It is by the joint labors of the religious enthusiast[1] who would inculcate a love of truth in order that he might build a righteous State, and the cold-blooded man of science who would exercise his intellect in a limited field of human experience and at the same time escape the hangman, that the ax has been laid at the root of the tree of despotism. The common enemy of each has been dogmatic teaching, supported by brute force. In the negative work of destruction, the man of science has been at one with the religious enthusiast who would found a righteous State.

(2) It is only during the stage in which science is being rapidly advanced that it necessarily makes for liberty and freedom of teaching.[2] Ascertained and accepted scientific facts admit of being taught dogmatically and tyrannically as well as theological dogma. If science does not enter into the service of the new and righteous State it will be appropriated by its old enemy, the despotic teacher. Already those who a little while ago would have slain the prophets of science have begun to garnish their tombs. The tyrant could ask no condition more favorable than that he be allowed to monopolize the new power which science furnishes,

and then that he be permitted to impose at the point of a sword a selected body of scientific teaching to the exclusion of all else.

It should ever be borne in mind that the difference between Europe and Asia, between despotism and freedom, depends, not so much upon the things taught as upon the method of the teaching. The man who sees in the universe nothing but matter and force will tend naturally to found the State upon force. He will tend naturally to suppress by violence all teaching inconsistent with his views, or he will become Machiavellian, and advocate the use of lying and deception as convenient substitutes for the other forces of nature. In either case the method is despotic.

(3) Thus far there has been much in common between the builders of the new and righteous State and the revealers of the new scientific world.[8] The State builders have, as far as possible, rid themselves of all prejudice and set themselves to learn all that is true about the growth of mind and character. They have made large use of external nature in the process of education and character building. The men of science have assumed a like attitude towards external nature. Ridding themselves of all prejudice, they have addressed themselves to the task of learning all that may be known of the universe, beginning with the contact of the senses with external nature. The stress of attention for the one has been upon matters subjective and spiritual; with the other it has been upon

matters external and phenomenal. The State has equal need for both classes. It has need of men who will know and follow the truth in all matters of mind and character, and in all matters of external relation. When the lie is cast out of politics, the righteous State will be assured.

It is a common delusion among the victims of the war-club philosophy of the State that democracy tends to crush out all diversity in education and to reduce all to a dead level of mediocrity. The precise opposite is the truth. Despotism tends to reduce the masses of mankind to a dead level of helpless dependence. Despotism tends to crush out all individuality, all diversity, and to force men down to a common level. All the forces and influences which for centuries have been working for the new State have tended to produce greater diversity, a wider range of individual development, a greater variety of talent, a greater division of labor. Where democracy has advanced farthest, there are the strongest tendencies to diversity in education.[4]

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER V

The Triumph of Science

[1] **The Family a Medium of Culture.**—The family life, as Froebel says, is the medium best fitted to promote the growth and expression of the good, pure heart and the thoughtful, pure mind; the true home — and after it and with it the kindergarten — will provide ample opportunity for the practice and illustration in their earliest forms of all those many sided virtues which St. Paul binds together under the one beautiful name of charity. But from the home as center the child's human kindliness and desire to help are to spread in ever widening circles outward till they embrace, for the full grown man or woman, all nations of men whom God hath made to dwell on all the face of the earth, reaching at length, and mingling with, and becoming one with the love of our Father which is in Heaven.

[2] **Standards of Truth.**— Standards of truth, skill, taste, efficiency, are the capitalized experience of society, essential to stability and progress. Of these standards the university is one of the guardians. To these, come what may, it must be true. No sympathy for individuals, no pressure of influence, no fear of retaliation, no desire for numbers must weaken fidelity to standards. Freedom of research, freedom of teaching, high ideals of productive scholarship and of professional integrity, conscientious and fearless appraisal of students' work are of vital concern to the university and to the state it serves. . . . The opportunities for service multiply with each year. We are coming to realize that good farming is no longer a robbing, but a recompensing of the soil; that it costs as much to plant bad seed as good; that sometimes cows are pensioners instead of producers; that bad highways are the heaviest road tax; that cheap schools are the

most expensive; that public health is national capital; that juvenile delinquency comes less from depravity than from deprivation; that industrial accidents are not lawyers' perquisites, but costs of production; that all idleness is not due to ignorance; that social legislation is not an amiable avocation, but an exacting profession; that municipal government should not be so skilfully designed to prevent bad men from doing harm, that it keeps honest and efficient men from doing good; that the United States must trust less to a "manifest destiny" and more to a constructive purpose. . . . Amid the conflicts and rivalries of many interests, parties, sects, sections, professions, social groups, the university must never waver from the position of an unimpassioned, unprejudiced seeker for the truth, all of it and that alone. . . . It must be true to the most rigorous laws of scientific method if the institution is to gain and hold its place as the "expert adviser of the State."—*George E. Vincent, in Inaugural Address of University of Minnesota.*

[3] **Church and State.**—These were the views which, during the latter half of the eighteenth century, began to dawn upon French thinkers. The extraordinary ability and success with which these eminent men cultivated their respective sciences, I have traced at a length greater than I had intended, but still very inadequate to the importance of the subject. Enough, however, has been brought forward to convince the reader of the truth of the proposition I wished to prove; namely, that the intellect of France was, during the latter half of the eighteenth century, concentrated upon the external world with unprecedented zeal, and thus aided that vast movement, of which the Revolution itself was merely a single consequence.

The intimate connection between scientific progress and social rebellion, is evident from the fact that both are suggested by the same yearning after improvement, the same dissatisfaction with what has been previously done, the same restless, prying, insubordinate, and audacious spirit.

But in France this general analogy was strengthened by the curious circumstances I have already noticed, by virtue of which the activity of the country was, during the first half of the

century, directed against the Church, rather than against the State; so that in order to complete the antecedents of the Revolution, it was necessary that, in the latter half of the century, the ground of attack should be shifted.

This is precisely what was done by the wonderful impetus given to every branch of natural science.—"*History of Civilization in England*," by *Henry Thomas Buckle, Vol. I, pp. 658, 659.*

[4] **State Encouragement of Education.**—It is equally legitimate duty, we believe, for the State to encourage certain of those higher activities of life, like science, literature, and art, which contribute to the civilization of a nation, when they cannot be had without such aid or encouragement. A nation which does not produce and does not care for such things can have, as Lecky has truly remarked, only an inferior and imperfect civilization. State expenditures for the support and encouragement of art add to the dignity of a nation. We agree with Edmund Burke that the State "is not a partnership in things subservient only to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature," but "a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection." Besides administering justice and protecting life and property, it is the plain duty of the state to see to it that the social and economic conditions under which the individual is compelled to live are such that he can develop his latent abilities, make the most of the faculties with which he is endowed by nature, and thus realize fully the ends of his existence. In short, the state should be an instrument of economic and social progress. It should be the representative of social perpetuity, says Le Roy Beaulieu, and should see to it that the general conditions of rational existence do not deteriorate. This is the least that it can do, and it ought to do something toward the amelioration of those conditions. It ought, declares Dupont White, to take the lead in promoting progress, because it is more interested than the individual, has higher moral standards and is able to accomplish larger things for the public good that can be accomplished under private enterprise.—"*Introduction to Political Science*," by *James Wilford Garner, pp. 324 325.*

CHAPTER VI

THE SAFETY OF A DEMOCRACY

AS is the school so is the State. If in the school knowledge is imposed by authority supported by force, the State becomes despotic. This we find even among the Greeks. The Greeks had the idea of the State founded on reason and a sense of justice, yet because the Greeks included only a part of the people in the brotherhood of rulers, and because among the Greeks education was in a measure imposed by force, the Greek State at its best tended to become despotic. If in the school, knowledge is not imposed, if what is done to the pupil be determined by what is discovered in the mind of the pupil, then the State, whatever may be the form which it assumes, is not despotic, it is democratic. In a democratic State the teacher controls himself. He religiously refrains from imposing himself or his views upon the minds of the helpless and the immature. He discovers native and acquired powers in those whom he would educate, and he lends a helping hand, he points out the way for further growth. He never sets himself up as an authority. In a democratic State the teacher who does not definitely intend to make out of his pupils better authorities than he is

himself, is an unmitigated nuisance. He is still in the toils of Asiatic despotism.

(1) After a certain stage has been reached in the development of the democratic State, the power to impose the so-called "safe opinions" of the day upon the rising generation is lost.[1] Parents and teachers and churches and rulers lose the power to impose their views. The effort to impose in the old way becomes a positive influence to induce the opposite view and the opposite conduct. A common observation among foreign residents in the United States is that little children refuse to speak their native tongue at the dictation of their parents. After breathing the free air of the American school they carry its language into the family, and the parents are powerless to prevent it. The very best that parents can do under such conditions is to take Froebel's advice, get acquainted with their children, and seek to live with them on terms of friendship. The use of the dear native tongue may be prolonged by love and friendly admonition, while the attempt to prolong it by force creates an intolerable disgust. Parents, teachers and statesmen in democratic States reach the limit of their powers to secure the adoption of their views when they have made as clear a statement as they are capable of making, and when they have exhausted their efforts in adapting the reasons in support of their views to the apprehension of their fellowmen. As the State progresses, all sug-

gestion of the use of force will play into the hands of the enemy.

(2) In the anti-State, or the despotic State, there is just one doctrine which is supremely dangerous, which threatens directly the very life of the State; this is the doctrine that the people may be safely trusted to think and act for themselves. This doctrine is treason to the State, and must be suppressed at all hazards. In the democratic State there is likewise one doctrine which threatens the life of the State. That is the doctrine that it is dangerous to trust the people to think and act for themselves.[2] Yet the democratic State from its very nature must allow this dangerous doctrine to be freely held and promulgated. It cannot lift a finger by way of suppression without being false to its principles. The democratic State must freely allow its sovereign to be maligned and lied about and, in a sense, conspired against; and it can meet such attacks only by the mild means of counter statement or the slow processes of education and training. It has thus far been a source of great weakness to all democratic States that a large proportion of the most influential of the people are conscientious believers in the despotic State.

(3) It is hard to convince the wise and prudent who have inherited the effects of centuries of training under despotic rule, that wisdom can come from the comparatively ignorant masses. They still refuse to believe that wisdom in modern pedagogy has been derived from

gaining the point of view of the child and the youth. It is from idiots themselves that we learn wise methods of dealing with idiots. There have been thousands of years of dealing with criminals from the standpoint of authority. The wisest of statesmen and jurists have had to do with the subject. Every imaginable method of treatment which human ingenuity could devise has been tried; yet until about a hundred years ago there was a strange lack of any accumulated wisdom on the subject of criminology. At that time it began to dawn upon the minds of a few philanthropists that the source of wisdom about the criminal was the criminal himself. Howard made himself a companion of criminals. He literally put himself in their place, and thus he began a revolution which has ever since been gradually commending itself to rulers in all civilized States. States have become wise in the treatment of criminals in exact proportion to the willingness of rulers to base their policy upon a sympathetic acquaintance with the criminal classes.[8] What is said of criminals is certainly equally true of paupers, of the insane, and of defectives generally. If, then, in the case of the defectives it is the aim of statesmen to overcome their defects and gain for them the position of free normal members of society, surely the statesman ought not to be less willing to learn wisdom from normal citizens.

(4) In a democratic State, wisdom comes from the masses not because the many individually see the truth more clearly than the few, not because the many are

individually more virtuous, but because, from the very nature of the case, the thoughts, feelings and purposes of the many make up the determining life of the State. In such a State every virtuous citizen, high and low, is seeking to induce his government to remove some form of manifest injustice or to adopt some policy of greater beneficence. The effective leader is he who most clearly apprehends the better tendencies of his fellow citizens, who outlines most clearly the aspirations of the people.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER VI

The Safety of a Democracy

[1] **Charity.**—In the meanwhile, if anyone would write, and bring his helpful hand to the slow-moving reformation which we labor under, if truth have spoken to him before others, or but seemed at least to speak, why should we trouble that man with asking license to do so worthy a deed? and not consider this, that if it come to prohibiting, there is not aught more likely to be prohibited than truth itself; whose first appearance to our eyes, bleared and dimmed with prejudice and custom, is more unsightly and unplausible than many errors; even as the person is of many a great man, slight and contemptible to see.

And what do they tell us vainly of new opinions, when this very opinion of theirs, that none must be heard but whom they like, is the worst and newest opinion of all others; and is the chief cause why sects and schisms do so much abound, and true knowledge is kept at distance from us; besides yet a greater danger which is in it. For when God shakes a kingdom, with strong and healthful commotions, to a general reforming, it is not untrue that many sectaries and false teachers are then busiest in seducing.

But yet more true it is, that God then raises to his own work, men of rare abilities, and more than common industry, not only to look back and revive what hath been taught heretofore, but to gain further, and to go on some new enlightened steps in the discovery of truth. For such is the order of God's enlightening his church, to dispense and deal out by degrees his beam, so as our earthly eyes may best sustain it.

Neither is God appointed and confined, where and out of what place these His chosen shall be first heard to speak; for He sees

not as man sees, chooses not as man chooses, lest we should devote ourselves again to set places and assemblies, and outward callings of men; planting our faith one while in the old convocation house; and another while in the chapel, at Westminster; when all the faith and religion that shall be there canonized, is not sufficient without plain convincement, and the charity of patient instruction, to supple the least bruise of conscience, to edify the meanest Christian, who desires to walk in the spirit, and not in the letter of human trust, for all the number of voices that can be there made; no, though Harry the Seventh himself there, with all his liege tombs about him, should lend them voices from the dead to swell their number.—"*Milton's Prose Works,*" *Vol. II, p. 98.*

[2] **Thomas Jefferson to Colonel Edward Carrington.**—The tumults in America, I expected would have produced in Europe an unfavorable opinion of our political state. But they have not. On the contrary, the small effect of these tumults, seems to have given more confidence in the firmness of our government. The interposition of the people themselves on the side of government, has had a great effect on the opinion here. I am persuaded myself, that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army. They may be led astray for a moment, but will soon correct themselves. The people are the only censors of their governors; and even their errors will tend to keep these, to the true principles of their institutions. To punish these errors too severely, would be to suppress the only safeguard of the public liberty.

The way to prevent these irregular interpositions of the people is to give them full information of their affairs through the channel of the public papers, and to contrive that those papers should penetrate the whole mass of the people. The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers, and be capable of reading

them. I am convinced that those societies (as the Indians) which live without government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness, than those who live under the European governments. Among the former, public opinion is in the place of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as laws ever did, anywhere. Among the latter, under pretense of governing, they have divided their nations into two classes, wolves and sheep.

I do not exaggerate. This is a true picture of Europe. Cherish, therefore, the spirit of our people, and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. If once they become inattentive to the public affairs, you, and I, and Congress, and Assemblies, judges and governors, shall all become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions; and experience declares that man is the only animal which devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe, and to the general prey of the rich on the poor.—*Dated at Paris, Jan. 16, 1787.—"Thomas Jefferson," Vol. II, pp. 84, 85.*

[8] **Atavism.**—It is now recognized that among the paupers and ne'er-do-wells that burden every community there are many who are victims of "atavism," as it is called, that is, they have inherited a type of character which dates back to some remote ancestor. This obsolete type, though long discounted by social development, is not entirely eliminated from heredity and is liable to crop out occasionally as a dominant characteristic in persons "born tired." Of course, it isn't easy to determine whether a person is physically incapable of hard labor or only disinclined to perform it. It matters little. The person whom the conditions of civilized life cannot tempt into systematic industry is not likely, either in himself or his posterity, to be useful to society, whose care should therefore be to insure by all humane means his effectual elimination. On the other hand it is as irrational as it is unprofitable to reproach or upbraid him.

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW. PART VII

1. What is the meaning of education in a Despotism? In a Democracy? What are the peculiar meanings of the words "State" and "Government" as applied to Sparta? What constituted the strength of the Spartan State? Did the State, or Brotherhood, include mere subjects? Were Spartan officers at the same time subjects? How was the State finally destroyed? Was the State a successful ruler? Could it rule conquered States?

2. Why did Athenians admire the Spartans? What is the difference between a political State and a Despotism according to Aristotle? What is the aim of the State according to the Greeks? What place did the Greeks give to education in the State? How did the Greeks affect the Romans? How the church? Their relation to the Reformation? How does Utopia differ from Plato's Republic?

3. Give facts showing the immense circulation of the Bible. How does Biblical teaching serve to unite the race? What striking difference between Greek and Hebrew teachings? What are the tendencies of Greek and Hebrew teachings as to universal brotherhood? What classes have received most readily Biblical teaching? How was the English language preserved? What

THE MIKADO'S PALACE, TOKIO, JAPAN

facts illustrate movements from the lower to higher classes in society?

4. How was the French Revolution produced? How did Pestalozzi differ from other reformers? What was his aim? Why did he turn to the child? What is the new education? What is the difference between the new education and that of the Greeks? In what respects are they alike? Why did the Greeks miss the true ideal? What are some of the chief discoveries of the modern teacher?

5. The new education is the effect of what and the cause of what? What has been the relation of science to despotic government? How has science favored toleration? What contrast between men of science and the founders of the new education? How did the new education favor the triumph of science? Is science capable of becoming a bulwark of tyranny? Does materialism tend to support despotism? Does the State need both subjective and objective truth? Does democracy tend to diversity?

6. Can education by force continue in other than a despotic State? Is it possible to impose "safe opinions" in a democracy? How can safe opinions be made to prevail? What opinion is dangerous in a despotism? What in a democracy? Must the democratic State tolerate despotic teachings? How do we learn wisdom as to the best method of dealing with defectives? Why is a knowledge of the masses so important in a democracy?

SUBJECTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY

1. The Spartan State.

2. Plato's Republic. Aristotle's politics and ethics. Utopia.

3. The historical parts of the Pentateuch: Judges, Samuel, Kings, Daniel, Gospels, Acts.

4. Pestalozzi and Froebel.

5. Conflict between science and theology.

6. The liberty of teaching in schools of every name.

PART VIII

Cooperation in the Democratic State

CHAPTER I

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION

IN previous chapters we have seen that the thing which has been effective in the binding together of the people into States has been a habit of united action. The primitive village State was founded upon a common ownership of land and coöperative farming. This was followed by coöperative fighting against a common enemy. In so far as there was a binding force in a feudal State, it rested chiefly upon these two forms of associated effort. In the towns and cities municipal corporations were in their origin industrial coöperative societies. There were long centuries of training in coöperative industries before there were individual industries. With the advent of democracy there is a marked tendency to enlarge the coöperative functions of the State. This is what democracy means. It is a conscious organizing for the more perfect accomplishment of a common purpose. In no business is this more manifest than in that of education.

In former chapters education has been discussed with reference to its effect on the citizen. We now

discuss the business of education as a coöperative function of the democratic State. It is assumed that a successful democracy involves continuous training of all the people. By simply narrating the facts respecting what has already been accomplished by one democratic community or another, the scope of this work may be apprehended.

(1) At the age of three the child enters the kindergarten. The teacher has been trained through the agency of the State. In a sense the teacher of the kindergarten may be said to be divinely appointed, as the work rests upon her natural gifts. In a sense she is self-appointed, since the teacher recognizes and cultivates natural faculties. In a sense the children choose their teachers, since one not suited to their need would not be retained. The mothers choose the teacher because they are first to recognize and voice the needs of the children. The adult male voter simply accepts and gives legal effect to these previously determined facts. In an ideal system of education similar principles are operative in all its parts. The professor in the university has the native gift of teaching. This gift he recognizes and cultivates. His pupils recognize and approve. The public gives to the facts legal status. As in kindergarten and university, so in all intervening stages in the process of education.

The kindergarten teacher reaches all the people. Through the mothers' meeting her influence extends not only to the three-year-old, but to the beginning of

life. Thus the agency of the State begins when life begins. An ideal already realized in the best democratic communities furnishes continuous education of all the people to the age of sixteen—not the same training for all, but a continuous training in State schools for the whole people. From the public school the pupil graduates into the public library. The very object of the school is to cultivate a habit of intellectual and moral growth which will continue to the end of life. All teachers in such a community would be *ex officio* librarians. The city, the township, the county and the State would furnish reading matter for all the people. In the democratic State no youth should be sent adrift at the perilous age of sixteen. His education should be continued through the librarian. Through a system of circulating libraries our States and counties may easily furnish reading matter suited to the needs of all the people.[1] These may be supplemented by the great metropolitan and national libraries, so that no one will lack for means of intellectual growth in whatever line he may choose. Thus, through school and library, the State becomes a coöperative society for the continuous training of all the people.[2]

(2) The truly democratic State abhors a dead level of uniformity. The age of sixteen may be fixed upon as a limit for the continuous training of all, because so many years are required for the insurance of a well-developed physical constitution. But at this age there is no break in education. Those who do not graduate

into the library and into business life go on with free tuition through the high school and through the university. In the higher grades greater diversity is offered in the lines of study. Then special schools are maintained by the State for meeting special needs. There are schools for the training of teachers, for the education of seamen and soldiers, for the training of officers in the civil service, as well as an endless variety of schools for industrial training. Some of these schools are deemed so important that the pupils receive a generous support while undergoing training.

(3) Other features of coöperative education in the democratic State are illustrated by the collection and dissemination of information on a great variety of subjects of common interest, by the establishment of museums and the display of works of art, by the maintenance of men and institutions devoted to the advancement of the bounds of knowledge. The State also furnishes special education for the defective, the blind, the mute, the feeble-minded, the juvenile criminal. And in the hands of the fully developed democracy the penitentiary becomes a training school whereby the State attempts the difficult task of the restoration of lapsed manhood.

The school for children is necessarily a local institution. It unites the people of the entire neighborhood in a most interesting and exacting coöperative enterprise. The school is an enlarged communal family. The public school compels the people to gain experience

in local government. The library is a scarcely less important agency in the accumulation of valuable cooperative experience. But a library for all the people involves a larger area than the school district. For village and country the county is a convenient area, and by the library freely circulating to every part the county becomes united and instinct with civic life. But the perfect library system would involve a free interchange between counties; it would involve the cooperation of State governments, the United States government, and all the great libraries; and the common school as well as the library involves this same comprehensive cooperation on the part of all our governmental areas.

CHAPTER I

COÖPERATIVE EDUCATION

[1] **A New Aid to Popular Education: Free Traveling Libraries.**—The New York State traveling library system is a direct development of the work of the public library. The local library lends one book; the traveling library lends a hundred. The local library lends to one person, the other to a community. One lends for two weeks, the other for six months. In this way the State library becomes the parent of libraries.

This system was made possible by the legislation of the State of New York in 1892. The university law of that year authorized the Regents to lend for a limited time selections of books from the duplicate department of the State library or from books specially given or bought for this purpose, to public libraries under State supervision, or to communities meeting required conditions. Out of $25,000 appropriated for free libraries a portion was at once set apart for the Regents to buy and prepare books to be lent under their rules.

The rules then adopted provide that a selection of one hundred books may be lent for six months to the trustees of any public library in the State under Regents' visitation on payment of a fee of five dollars to cover the expense of cases, catalogues, record blanks, and transportation both ways. Where no such library exists, the books will be lent on the petition of any twenty-five resident taxpayers. In their petition an owner of real estate must be named as trustee, who would be personally responsible for the books. Libraries may be lent to the officers of a university-extension center, reading course, or study club, if registered by the Regents. A later rule offers selections of fifty volumes for a fee of three dollars.

* * * * * * * *

We may say that 25,000 books have been read as a result of

these traveling libraries. They have been good books and have left their mark on a multitude of minds. These libraries have everywhere promoted an interest in good reading, and have already led to the establishment of some important local libraries. They have been cordially received and are more in demand now than ever before. As a public investment they have fully vindicated the wisdom of their projectors and have proved worthy of the continued interest of the State. The system admits, too, of indefinite enlargement. Special-subject libraries may be multiplied as fast as they are wanted, and the addition of general libraries can keep pace with the publication of good books. The State of New York can well afford this offer of books to her citizens, which is at once generous and, in the highest sense, profitable; and the plan is confidently commended to the consideration of other States.—*William R. Eastman, "The Forum," Vol. XVIII, pp. 616, 671.*

The Traveling Library.—Since Carlyle laid down the proposition that "the true university is a collection of books," there have been many attempts to popularize this means of education. The growth of great public libraries in our cities has been full of significance as a phase of our higher social endeavor. Outside the great centers of population this development of library centers has been less noticeable, but perhaps not less continuous, and certainly not less deserving of attention.

At first Carlyle's university was an exclusive institution. Only the aristocracy had access to it. Then came the era of subscription libraries in the larger towns, and then the founding of libraries for the free use of the people, to be maintained by general tax.

Massachusetts has always been foremost among our States in the diffusion of library privileges among her citizens, and it is probably true today that no other like community in the world is so well supplied with books, or at least with the opportunity to use and read books. But for various reasons the Massachusetts system of town libraries, excellent as it is, cannot be successfully adapted to the conditions of every State in the Union. At any rate, the fact is that there are many communities,

even in States that have adequate laws permitting taxation for library purposes, still destitute of the advantages which so large a proportion of the rural population of Massachusetts now enjoys.

There are towns, villages and cities still in this country that will not tax themselves to secure for their citizens an entrance into Carlyle's university.

The problem thus becomes, not merely how many towns can be induced to start free libraries, but how can the people, particularly the growing children and youth, in towns and country districts where no public libraries exist, be helped to share in library privileges at once, without waiting for the communities themselves to take the initiative?

In some States much has already been done in this direction through "traveling libraries."

* * * * * * * *

Finally, to all who are studying the advantages of the traveling library for country places we commend the summary of those advantages made by the Wisconsin Commission after an experience of nearly two years in the backwoods of their State.

1. It makes good literature accessible, and often a constant temptation, in communities where there are few distractions and no other similar educational forces for any but the younger children.

2. It puts the control of the reading of numbers of people in the hands of persons who have the library experience of the world at their command, while the literary tastes of the readers are forming.

3. It is economical. There is no expense for local rent, for fuel, light, or librarian's salary. Books are bought at the lowest prices; there is no wastage from worthless books or shoddy editions, and the volumes are worn out by use, and not by mere shelf-wear.

4. It keeps up a continual interest in the books by frequent exchanges, and the prospect of a near exchange keeps each family alert to learn about the best books and to get them promptly.

5. The responsibility of caring for a library and extending its usefulness makes a common bond for a high purpose, and a new basis of union for the best citizens in small neighborhoods.

6. The library stations form new centers for the upbuilding of a better social and intellectual life.

To sum up briefly, the traveling library gives an abundant supply of wholesome literature to the people of small communities at a slight cost, and not only excites their interest in such literature, but confines their reading to it until their tastes are formed.

It is a free day and night school, which does not close on Saturdays or Sundays or for long vacations. It instructs, inspires and amuses the old as well as the young, and its curriculum is so broad that it helps the housewife in the kitchen, the husbandman in the field, the mechanic in his shop, the teacher in her school, the invalid in the sick-room, the boy in his play, and the citizen in his civic duties.

It leaves no room for bad literature and keeps it from circulating, without resort to threats, by the most natural and wholesome methods.—*William B. Shaw in "American Review of Reviews," Vol. XVII, p. 165.*

CHAPTER II

PUBLIC SANITATION

THE medical profession has followed pretty closely the development of the State. While the State was despotic the practice of medicine was made a part of the tyranny. In early times the medicine-man was a wonder-worker. With the priest he was a most efficient agency for the enslavement of the minds of the people. In the more enlightened tyrannies of modern times medicine has followed the analogy of the government. It has been imposed upon the people. The doctor assumed all knowledge while the people were kept in ignorance. Familiar diseases and symptoms were disguised by unfamiliar names. It was accounted unprofessional for the patients to be enlightened as to their real condition. It was likewise unprofessional to enlighten the people as to the nature of the remedies used and the effects they were expected to produce. Long after the Reformation even in the most enlightened nations, the insane were accounted victims of evil spirits. Flogging of the insane was a common method of inducing the evil spirit to withdraw. This practice continued after the belief in the possession of devils was much weakened. George III., it is said, commended his physician for his faithfulness in admin-

istering the rod to his royal back during his fits of derangement. Not until the democratic State had become well developed, that is, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, did the treatment of the insane become an important coöperative social function administered by the State.

(1) The entire medical profession and practice is being revolutionized. No longer does it inflict occult treatment upon an ignorant people. On the contrary, the people are taken into the confidence of the physician and instructed in the laws of health. In all enlightened countries the medical profession is doing pioneer work towards the perfecting of the democratic State. Everywhere the profession is enforcing the doctrine that health can be maintained only by the training of all the people in the observance of sanitary laws.[1]

(2) There is high authority for saying that it is man's duty to rule over the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air. In the light of medical science this means not so much the rattlesnake, the tiger, and the hawk. It means rather the Asiatic cholera, the plague, diphtheria, and typhoid. These are, one and all, beasts of the sewer or fowls of the air which have served notice upon the peoples, if you do not rule us, we will kill you. In the light of medical science there is no longer any disguise about this issue. A brood of typhoid microbes, propagated, probably, in the sweatshops of London, effected a lodgment in the veins of Prince Albert, and the beloved Prince succumbed.

These enemies of human life respect not persons. The English are learning that the plague has no regard for hoary caste in India; and what is more important, they are learning that effective sanitation involves the breaking up of caste distinctions, or such a training of the people as will result in true democratic coöperation.[2] These Asiatic plagues which at one time laid low the half of both man and beast in England, we now see are calls from the victims of tyranny in the old home upon the freer and more privileged West to come and deliver them.

(3) Public sanitation in our cities has tended greatly to the promotion of civic righteousness. Almost every conceivable abomination affecting the property and the convenience of the people is committed by bosses and factions in our cities. But no boss, no faction, no soulless corporation, has ever taken a stand in favor of diphtheria or the typhoid. The typhoid gets a grip upon the civic conscience which the most relentless reformer cannot attain. In the light of modern science the prevalence of many contagious diseases means murder. And the man who is responsible for city sanitation can have no assurance that the victim may not be a member of his own family. The hardened sinner who may have lived upon blackmail and extortion, who may without remorse have bargained away the people's franchises, will not look lightly upon the spread of a preventable disease. In such a case the consciousness of guilt fastens itself upon the whole city

and the demand for righteous and efficient action becomes irresistible. Righteousness, like disease, is contagious. It is not possible to maintain honesty and efficiency in one department of civic life without developing a tendency for the same to spread to other departments.

(4) Effective sanitation involves, in the first place, effective education and training of all the people. The State, through the school, and the library; through the board of health and the medical profession, must become argus-eyed, alert and intelligent. All this may be attained and yet sanitation may entirely fail. There must be an added consciousness, a feeling of responsibility resting upon the people, a sense of guilt in the presence of preventable disease, a continued repentance and a disposition to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. This may be attained even, and yet there may not be effective sanitation. There must be in addition efficient agencies for administering the public conscience. So long as the voter tolerates the spoilsman, the briber, and the franchise grabber, the body politic will carry the guilt of the murder of the innocents.

In former chapters three pretty clearly marked stages have been noticed in the evolution of the State. In the first, force is pitted against the organizing ability of the people; government is simply imposed. In the second the so-called rights of the people are exalted above the State, and government is tolerated as a necessary evil. In the ideal democracy repressive gov-

ernment is confined to the abnormal individual, and the State becomes an organism for enlarging the sphere of the normal man. There are three corresponding stages in the profession of medicine. In the first, occult forces are imposed upon the people. Then medicine becomes chiefly occupied with the negative work of preventing diseases. In its final stage the profession will be occupied chiefly in the discovery and promulgation of laws for the improvement and perfection of the race.[3]

Capitals of the World

THE NATIONAL PALACE, CITY OF MEXICO, MEXICO

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER II

Public Sanitation

[1] **Public Education.**—The splendid public health work done by our government in Cuba, the Canal Zone and Manila shows what Americans should soon be doing at home. We need a national health bureau, and we need in each state and in each district and municipality in each state thoroughly competent health officers. Efficient sanitation depends above all else in public education. In tuberculosis splendid progress has already been made along these lines, but much more remains to be done in the general field, the medical profession should do far more than it has done to educate the public. Sanitary laws will be efficient in a democracy just in proportion to the general intelligence about hygienic matters and no more. Medical advance depends, on the one hand, on scientific research, on the other on public education along hygienic lines. Every citizen should be inspired with love of personal and public hygiene as were the Greeks. Every physician should be deeply grounded in physiologic medicine and provided with proper facilities for using it practically. Every officer of public health should know thoroughly the contribution of etiologic medicine. All efforts should be made to promote these most fundamental needs of society.—*C. R. Bardeen, of University of Wisconsin, in Science, Oct. 20, 1911.*

[2] **The Right of the State.**- The right of the State to deal with the entire subject of medical education in its own interest can assuredly not be gainsaid. The physician is a social instrument. If there were no disease, there would be no doctors. And as disease has consequences that immediately go beyond the individual specifically affected, society is bound to protect itself

against unnecessary spread of loss or danger. It matters not that the making of doctors has been to some extent left to private institutions. The State already makes certain regulations; it can by the same right make others. Practically the medical school is a public service corporation. It is chartered by the State; it utilizes public hospitals on the ground of the social nature of its service. The medical school can not then escape social criticism and regulation. It was left to itself while society knew no better. But civilization consists in the legal registration of gains won by science and experience; and science and experience have together established the terms upon which medicine can be most useful. "In the old days," says Metchnikoff, "any one was allowed to practice medicine, because there was no medical science and nothing was exact. Even at the present time among less civilized people any old woman is allowed to be a midwife. Among more civilized races, differentiation has taken place and child births are attended by women of special training who are midwives by diploma. In case of nations still more civilized, the trained midwives are directed by obstetric physicians who have specialized in the conducting of labor." Legislation which should procure for all the advantage of such conditions as is now possible would speedily bring about a reconstruction quite as extensive as that described. Such control in the social interest inevitably encounters the objection that individualism is thereby impaired. So it is, at that level; so it is intended. The community through such regulation undertakes to abridge the freedom of particular individuals to exploit certain conditions for their personal benefit. But its aim is thereby to secure for all others more freedom at a higher level. Society forbids a company of physicians to pour out upon the community a horde of ill-trained physicians, their liberty is indeed clipped. As a result, however, more competent doctors being trained under the auspices of the state itself, the public health is improved; the physical well-being of the wage worker is heightened; and a restriction put upon the liberty, so-called, of a dozen doctors increases the effectual liberty of all other citizens. Has democracy, then, really suffered a set-back? Reorganization along rational lines involves the strengthening,

not the weakening, of democratic principle, because it tends to provide the conditions upon which well-being and effectual liberty depend.—*Abraham Flexner, in "Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching."*

Victorian Medicine.—It is notorious, however, that the State medicine is as yet but the infant Hercules in the cradle, although it has really shown its prowess in the strangling of serpents which have come within its grasp. Even now, if it were allowed freely to exercise its powers, it could practically extinguish the large class of infectious and contagious disorders which spread like bush-fires in our midst. The whole group of "filth-diseases" could be virtually wiped out. Nor can it be doubted that it could immensely diminish the dire mass of hereditary disease which now bears its doom of life-weakness and premature death. And from this point of view it is not too much to say that as a simple matter of course it should be consulted upon the primary question of choice in marriage. It has often been pointed out that if a *genus homo* were cultivated as are the domestic animals, a large amount of the disease of the nation would be speedily bred out of the blood, and a high physique readily attained. But as this can hardly be, man's own intelligence instructed by medicine, should take the place of the skill of the stock-owner. So that with this growing consciousness of its power gradually to abolish in these classes the great bulk of the disease of mankind, the medicine of the best and highest type, looks forward confidently to a future in which its remedial faculty shall decline both in relative scope and importance, and when its chief function will be the care and nurture of the whole physical existence of man. For it is to be particularly noticed that hitherto State medicine has been developed on its prophylactic side only, which is, after all, but its *negative* power. It has been strictly "preventive medicine"; and its *positive* function of cultivating the best, and eradicating the worst physical tendencies of the race, of watching over all the springs of health, has been hardly thought of as within its effective range.—*H. Baptist Crofts, in "The Westminster Review," Nov., 1897, p. 572.*

CHAPTER III

SANITATION (Continued)

IN an informal talk with a company of clergymen, I referred to the share which kindergarten pupils have in choosing their teachers, and one of the company remarked that if there was a way whereby they could choose their parents the chief difficulty would be solved. The remark was intended to be facetious, but it suggests the profoundest of human problems. There may be a difficulty in a merely potential human being signifying a choice; but if there is an entity in this universe which possesses unqualified rights, it is that same potential human being. There will not be a just State until the normal citizens who have incurred the experience of being born and brought up see to it that the not yet existing citizen shall begin his existence under such conditions as he would choose if he already possessed the accumulated wisdom of the generation which he succeeds. On this subject the expositors of a more perfect society, from Aristotle[1] to Herbert Spencer, have been agreed.

(1) The stress of attention in recent years in the medical profession has been upon surgery and contagious diseases, and in both lines the remarkable advance in the science grows out of the germ theory

of disease. Thus far the work is largely repressive and preventive. Yet scientific prevention soon reaches its limits in the work of destroying noxious germs and becomes increasingly occupied with the creation of vital conditions and vital powers which resist disease. But along with the marvelous advance in surgery and public sanitation, there has been a positive increase in the diseases which most directly affect the well-being of the race. No one has yet discovered the microbe which produces an unsound nervous condition. This disease will not be discovered by the microscope. It will not be removed by antiseptic surgery. Does any respectable medical authority put confidence in *materia medica* for the treatment of nervous diseases? In the presence of nervous disease science can simply give good advice and recommend the improvement of social conditions.[8] The most learned doctor is forced to rely upon "the foolishness of preaching."[9] Nervous disease is social in its nature. It grows out of adverse social, industrial and political conditions. It is maintained upon high medical authority that the modern assassin of emperors and presidents is the victim of a clearly defined nervous disease, generated under social conditions equally well defined. The victim of the disease is ready to commit suicide, and he prefers to do it in a spectacular way. Guiteau's last utterances were words of exultation, in view of the thought that his name "would go thundering down the ages."

In the treatment of nervous diseases the medical

profession is forced to take its place along with the teacher, the preacher, the prophet, the philosopher, and the statesman in striving for the creation of a righteous State. A sound mind in a sound body involves a just State.

(2) But there are types of nervous disease in respect to which the physician is coming to have something very specific and conclusive to say to statesmen. The germ theory of disease seems to demonstrate that some diseases formerly thought to be hereditary cannot be inherited. Yet the same practical result may be reached through the inheritance of a vital condition which results in peculiarly vulnerable tissue. As to nervous diseases, the evidence accumulates that many well-defined types are hereditary.[4] It is upon the basis of this evidence that the State is enabled to take the first definite step in guarding the rights of the potential human being. The first step will be in the orthodox line of repression and negation. The State will see to it that its citizens shall not be born feebleminded, or with a nervous organization which entails a life-long dread of insanity. The State-Church has already done a good deal of forbidding to marry; often, no doubt, upon inadequate grounds. But here is ground for repression which will commend itself to every sound-minded citizen. Such action on the part of the State will be of immense educational value. There will arise a sense of moral obligation to apply the principle far more extensively than can be attained through the

crude agencies of repression. From the moral obligation not to produce certain well-defined types of deformed human beings there will arise naturally a sense of obligation to produce the highest and the best.

It is said that the Norsemen worshiped the reindeer because they perceived that it manifested a superhuman wisdom in the generation of its species. This seems to be a confession of the doctrine that man is, in a sense, a fallen animal. Unless by his rational and social powers he rises above the reindeer, the perversion of his superior gifts dooms him to a lower place in the animal economy.

(3) Sanitation as well as education favorably illustrates the coöperative character of the democratic State. It is through the State that progress becomes possible. A learned jurist in England told me that when he had the fever he was taken to the common public hospital. He counted it an honor to be a member of the board for the management of that institution. Said he: "I advise my friends to become patients in the public hospitals when they are sick. The care given them is superior to that which they are likely to receive at home." The rich and the poor thus meet before the grave. A physician in a Western State had his wife treated in a State asylum for the insane. He became aware of many defects in the institution, and he initiated reforms which were extended to all similar institutions in the State.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER III

SANITATION (Continued)

[1] **Matrimonial Regulations.**—If, then, the legislator ought to take care that the bodies of the children are as perfect as possible, his first attention ought to be given to matrimony; at what time and in what situation it is proper that the citizens should engage in the nuptial contract. Now, with respect to this alliance, the legislator ought both to consider the parties and their time of life, that they may grow old at the same part of time, and that their bodily powers may not be different.—*"Aristotle on Government" (Morley's Universal Library), p. 261.*

[2] **Nerve Hygiene.**—For the suitable and appropriate care of habitual criminals, vagrants, incurable alcoholics, etc., and to make them permanently uninjurious, special agricultural establishments with workshops and compulsory work should be established. These should be placed under the direction of an alienist and under legal supervision. Institutions of this sort for the permanent care of individuals of diminished responsibility who are at the same time very injurious or dangerous to the community should be provided by law. . . . Nerve sanitoriums are to be reformed by the introduction of occupations for which the patients are systematically trained, as a therapeutic measure, and by the removal of alcoholic drinks. The same should be done with lunatic asylums so far as it has not been done already. Moreover, separate employment colonies should be established in the country for people with nervous troubles.—*"Hygiene of Nerves and Mind in Health and Disease," by August Forel, of the University of Zurich, pp. 333-335.*

"**Nervous Patients.**—I sincerely advise nervous patients to avoid, as much as possible, all drug remedies. Especially would I warn them against habitual use of benumbing narcotics, however seductively they may operate at first. In my opinion, all these means ultimately do more harm than good. Of immensely greater value than drugs to nervous patients are the natural factors of healing—air, light, water, quiet, exercise, etc.

The first thing required is, of course, to remove the fundamental causes of the disease. As much rest as possible should be given from without as well as from within; a true religious condition, which a sure faith gives, is, therefore, of inestimable value to patients. It is self-evident that they must try to be, as much as possible, in the open air, and mountain air is particularly advantageous to them.—*Bilsinger, in "Popular Science Monthly," November, 1893.*

"**Neurasthenia.**—The term neurasthenia does not so much signify a special affection of the nervous system as it is a fittingly chosen general name for a whole group of disorders, the character of which consists in the nervous system failing to act properly, on account of a deficiency of normal nerve substance.

Such a condition, or at least a pronounced tendency to it, is, in many cases, inherited from parents, and only slightly unfavorable circumstances are required in children thus hereditarily tainted for the development of pronounced neurasthenia.

There is, besides the hereditary form, an acquired weakness of the nerves, which may be produced by a considerable variety of causes. The blame for the present condition of our society undoubtedly lies in the haste and pressure of the age, with its battle for existence, driving us into morbidity.

The increase and crowded condition of lunatic asylums speaks with admonitory plainness in this matter, and it is time the right meaning was attached to the momentous phenomenon.

Even in the country, where the hygienic conditions are relatively favorable, the evil of nervous weakness is gradually making itself more plain. It is conspicuous in the larger cities, where,

with the meeting of the great masses of men, the clatter of railroads and the driving of factories, excitement prevails through day and night, under which the afflicted nerves with great difficulty obtain the rest they need.

To this haste and excitement in social life are added the schools with their augmented demands, and the trial of examinations. . . .

On the other hand, it cannot be too impressively insisted upon that the individual has the means to a certain degree in his own hands of alleviating by a rational mode of life, the general harm to which modern man is exposed.

But it has to be remarked that the greater number of us, in spite of all the instructions we get, remain in incredibly dense ignorance of matters of personal hygiene.

It thus occurs that many allow themselves to be guilty of sins against their own personality by which the health of their nerves is broken to the very marrow.

Besides overwork, on the one side, there are certain special indulgencies, abuse of spirits and other stimulants, the early and excessive tobacco smoking, and in the majority of cases all together, by which the nervous system is at last disordered and severely injured in its vigor.—*Ibid.*

CHAPTER IV

THE STATE AND VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS

THE despotic State does not resemble a voluntary organization. It is of the very essence of such a State that its power be imposed upon unwilling subjects. The democratic State tends more and more to approach the type of a voluntary association. Any sort of society which becomes organic and fulfills a purpose common to the body, carries in itself the elements of, or at least the suggestion of, sovereign power. A sewing society may exist without any organization. It may have no common will. The members may meet at stated times, simply to enlarge their individual spheres. But if the society develops a common purpose, if it proposes to do something as a society, especially if it proposes to do something which shall affect the conduct of each member in a definite way, then it must organize; it must create agencies for the accomplishment of its will. For the time being, the society becomes master of its members in respect to the matter in hand. By as much as the society fails to thus control its membership, by so much it fails to become a perfect organism.

(1) The people of these United States are making up their minds that every child of every race born in our midst shall be given the rudiments of an education,

and that every adult shall be furnished with wholesome reading matter in the lines of art, literature, poetry, history, religion, science, philosophy, sufficient in quantity for a life course in learning. To accomplish this end the people are making use of organs, some of them very old, and created and used for a very different purpose. They are using the township, the county, the state, and the United States government. For the sake of the argument, we may assume that when the people became possessed of this laudable purpose they were anarchists and did not believe in State education; that they determined to accomplish the same end through voluntary association. But a voluntary association accomplishing such a purpose would have organs corresponding to the township, county, state, and national government, and such an organization would be, in effect, an agency of the State, to which we are all subject.[1]

(2) A voluntary association may compel or induce the individual member to do a thing which he would prefer not to do, as effectively as the government. There is almost as much compulsion in efficient voluntary schools as in schools belonging to the State organism. A mere isolated human being is an idiot, or he lacks essential qualities of manhood. To be rational, to be a man, one must unite his will with the will of others. He must plan and act for and with other rational beings.[2] Man multiplies his individual powers by becoming a part of organized society. Each indi-

vidual in the Swiss commune counted for a hundred-fold more than so many unorganized men. When the communes projected their wills into the Cantons each individual became correspondingly more important. In recent years the importance of the citizen is greatly augmented by the organization of the Swiss State. By being a member of such a State the power to know, to do, and to be, is greatly enlarged.

The will of a society is something quite different from the aggregate wills of the individuals composing it. Reduce the society to discrete individuals and deprive them of all societary experience and they are idiots, one and all. Rational individual willing is learned through the process of uniting with others in the formation of a common will.[6] The individual will can be trained and exercised in the conscious effort to modify or change the common will. The individual submits to the common will as a necessary condition for the more effective projection of his own will and plans. These principles hold in all sorts of societies, in the sewing circle, in the club, in the athletic union, or in any human society.

(3) The State, however, differs in some respects from all other societies. The State is a society of societies. The State includes all the people within a given area, and hence in that area the subjects of every other society are likewise subjects of the State. If there are bands of thieves and robbers, the State seeks to destroy them. If there are societies for the

advancement of science, the State may aid or encourage them. The State includes all other societies or organizations, and it is itself subject to no other organization or power.

The one radical difference between the State and a mere voluntary association is found in the fact that membership in the State is not a matter of choice. One becomes subject to the State by birth or by entering its territory. The democratic State aims to secure the hearty coöperation of all its subjects; yet it will not permit an individual subject to withhold his support. It is in this quality that the democratic State vindicates its superiority to a mere voluntary coöperative society. A community of farmers may wish to rid themselves of the pest of Canada thistles, or of the spread of pleuro-pneumonia among their cattle. To this end they might form a voluntary association including all their number. In such a case one disaffected individual might balk the will of the entire community. He might refuse to coöperate or he might withdraw from the society. If, in such an emergency, such an organization creates agencies to compel membership and to compel the obedience of all, then it becomes the State, or for the time being it usurps its functions. The democratic State, therefore, has all the virtues of a mere voluntary society with this one virtue added. It enforces the will of the society against the disaffected individual. All societies attempt this; it is the peculiar mission of the State to do it.

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER IV

The State and Voluntary Associations

[1] **Functions of the State Touching Education.**—The State has educational functions beyond the maintenance of the schools. It is bound to help on whatever contributes to the sound information and promotes the culture of the people. Voluntary assemblages are to be encouraged. Discussions and publicity are the safety valves of democratic society. Home study is to be aided and guided. Local libraries may well be subsidized, if need be — at least up to the point where they can stand alone.

The State which can put a mark upon its map wherever there is a town or village library, and find its map well covered will take care of itself.

Art collections are upon the same footing as libraries. That State is a great State whose leading public men give genuine support — not a support born of ignorance and the lack of courage to refuse — but a sympathetic support to scientific research in the hope of hastening the time when the truth shall make the whole world free.

That State will outrun its neighbors which will give a strong and willing hand to the good cause of industrial and decorative art. It is peculiarly within the functions of the State to aid and promote architecture. Public buildings are worth more than they cost, jobbery and all, if they are architecturally effective. What could not a State do for the common culture by making sure that every school-house is erected upon artistic lines? All this, and more, is clearly within the province of the self-governing State.

One may ask if this does not savor too strongly of paternalism, and leave little or nothing to the initiative of the people.

It has no flavor of paternal government about it. There is no element of it which contributes to the support of the people in any instance. It does not trench so much as the hair's breadth upon the sound doctrine that the people must support the government and not count on the government to support the people. It leaves everything to the initiative of the people. It interdicts nothing. Every man is free to do what he will, if it is not inconsistent with the common rights and opposed to the common weal.

Indeed, all acts of the democratic government are upon the initiation of the people. It inspires individual initiative and encourages every individual impulse toward the promotion of the common good. It stands in the way of nothing but ignorance and selfishness, and it stops nothing but interference with the common interests of overgrown local officialism. There is little danger that it will do that as completely as may be desired.—*Andrew S. Draper, "Educational Review," New York, February, 1898, p. 118.*

[2] **The Will of the People.**—The sovereign which stands behind the authority of the law is the people of the United States; the people as a collective body, in the sense in which that word was really meant by Jefferson and by Rousseau. Not a majority of the people voting by state lines, as personified in the President; not a majority of the people voting by districts, as personified in the House of Representatives; but the people as represented by a common public sentiment which includes all good men, minorities as well as majorities, who support the government not as a selfish means for the promotion of their own interest, but as a common heritage which they accept as loyal members of a body politic, in a spirit which makes them ready to bear its burdens as well as to enjoy its benefits.

* * * * * * * *

When people live together in towns and cities and nations, they have to do certain things which they do not like. Bad governmental machinery may increase the number of these things, good governmental machinery may diminish them; but the necessity of doing some of them is always there. The ideal, so fondly

Capitals of the World

GOVERNMENT PALACE TOKIO JAPAN

cherished by the philosophers of a hundred years ago, of a complete system of organized non interference, has proved impracticable. What is for the interest of the whole is often going to be against the convenience of some of the parts. There are in the last resort two means of inducing a member of the community, when thus adversely affected, to subordinate his private interest to the general good,—his own conscience, and the policeman's club. If a large majority of people are ready to be governed by their consciences, the exercise of the policeman's club becomes unnecessary, except upon that small minority who are recognized as law breakers. Then, and only then, can we have real democracy.—"*Freedom and Responsibility*," *by Arthur Twining Hadley, pp. 35, 37.*

Political Unity.—It thus frequently happens that there exists in the minds of a community of people a desire for a political unity of a particular sort, and that this desire is of sufficient strength to maintain the unity of a State, were it once established and organized, but that objective conditions prevent for many years the realization of such an end. It is only when this pent-up flood of feeling rises to sufficient height and strength to burst the existing political barriers that hold it in, that a new State is created.

As has been said, the natural tendency of the feeling of Nationality is to find expression in political unity. The two sentiments, then, that lie at the basis of the Nation and of the State are largely similar. The same conditions that tend to create the feeling of Nationality tend also, in most cases, to demand the establishment of the State. Absolute identity of these two sentiments, however, cannot be affirmed. It is possible, in other words, to have present a well developed feeling of Nationality, with but slight desire for political unity.—"*The Nature of the State*," *by Westel Woodbury Willoughby, p. 150.*

cherished by the philosophers of a hundred years ago, of a complete system of organized non-interference, has proved impracticable. What is for the interest of the whole is often going to be against the convenience of some of the parts. There are in the last resort two means of inducing a member of the community, when thus adversely affected, to subordinate his private interest to the general good,— his own conscience, and the policeman's club. If a large majority of people are ready to be governed by their consciences, the existence of the policeman's club becomes unnecessary, except upon that small minority who are recognized as law breakers. Then, and only then, can we have real democracy.—"*Freedom and Responsibility*," by *Arthur Twining Hadley*, pp. 35, 37.

"**Political Unity.**—It thus frequently happens that there exists in the minds of a community of people a desire for a political unity of a particular sort, and that this desire is of sufficient strength to maintain the unity of a State, were it once established and organized, but that objective conditions prevent for many years the realization of such an end. It is only when this post-ty flood of feeling rises to sufficient height and strength to burst the existing political barriers that hold it in, that a new State is created.

As has been said, the natural tendency of the feeling of Nationality is to find expression in political unity. The two sentiments, then, that lie at the basis of the Nation and of the State are largely similar. The same conditions that tend to create the feeling of Nationality tend also, in most cases, to demand the establishment of the State. Absolute identity of these two sentiments, however, cannot be affirmed. It is possible, in other words, to have present a well-developed feeling of Nationality, with but slight desire for political unity.—"*The Nature of the State*," by *Westel Woodbury Willoughby*, p. 120.

CHAPTER V

INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLIES

THE democratic State is the perfected voluntary coöperative organization. It surpasses the mere voluntary association in efficiency in that, without departing from its essential voluntary character, it carries in itself the means of preventing its will from being thwarted by its disaffected members. A voluntary society which should attempt to educate all the youth of the land and to continuously provide reading matter for all adults would find its will thwarted and prevented in a thousand ways. The State can do this because it has many ways for removing individual obstruction. The State can do this because the activity of the State is not subject to the capricious will of one generation of men; it embodies and seeks to express the wisdom and experience of former generations. The State can do this because it furnishes the highest possible incentive to the enlightened individual to labor for the enlightenment of public functionaries. If a policy is in itself reasonable and commends itself to the intelligent conscience, the individual has the highest assurance that whatever of enlightenment he may contribute will be conserved. The democratic State will become an organ for the education of all peoples

because to this end Hebrew patriarchs and prophets labored and prayed; to this end Greek philosophers penetrated the mysteries of life; to this end preachers and reformers have given their lives. The democratic State can fulfill all these desires and aspirations as no other agency can do it. By the very law of its being the democratic State must seek to educate, to enlighten, to humanize all people of all lands.

(1) The principle of coöperation holds in the matter of sanitation. It is the democratic State, and the democratic State alone, that furnishes any rational prospect for so conserving and expressing the wisdom of the ages as to rid mankind of many of the most deadly diseases. Neither voluntary association nor the despotic State furnish any rational ground of hope for pervasive and efficient sanitation.

Besides education and sanitation, along with the growth of democracy there have arisen other coöperative enterprises which give increased importance to the coöperative State. Not until the age of democracy did the world know an efficient postal system. The telegraph, in nearly all lands, is made a part of the postal system. To this is now being added telephonic service. These enterprises are by nature suited to the coöperative State.

(2) In all sorts of States the maintenance of highways has for long ages been made a part of the State's functions. In recent times the railway has supplanted in large part the highway. And the function of the

railway is in its nature a State function. The State may neglect education; it may disregard sanitation; it cannot ignore the railway. In England as soon as there were competing lines between London and Edinburgh the government interfered to prevent railway wars and to establish rates. The State not only recognized pooling contracts, but it compelled agreement and enforced pooling contracts. In England, therefore, the railway business was made from the beginning a function of the State. The companies became agencies of the State. The State-controlled railways in England have not become the owners of the coal, the iron, the oil, and the staple products generally. They have not been made an agency for the monopolization of all sorts of business in which freightage was a considerable item of expense. In America, on the other hand, the railways have been treated largely as private enterprises. They have not been effectively controlled by the State. The result is that in America the railways have been working out their proper nature, and have been moving in the direction of becoming one vast coöperative organism controlling not only transportation, but more and more determining the metes and bounds of every industry which is dependent upon transportation. The railway business being a State function, if the State fails to recognize this fact, the railway and its allied industries will in time become the State. The form of such a State would be a centralized despotic, or paternal, government in which the

people would live by the permission of the despotic rulers. The railway business will lend itself as readily to the strengthening of tyranny as of democracy. The railway adds infinitely to the organic character of the State. If democracy courageously attacks the problems connected with it and makes the new public highway an integral part of the democratic State, as the Swiss have done, then the railway will add strength and coherence to the State. In default of this, the system will strengthen despotic tendencies.[1]

The modern city is in part a creation of the railway. The democratic city becomes more and more an industrial coöperative association. Sanitation and sewerage call for unlimited supplies of pure water. The democratic city by its own agents supplies itself with water. There is need of light in street and dwelling, and the supply of this through city agencies gives additional valuable experience to the coöperative society. Then there is the street-car service, which is by nature a public city function. All these agencies managed directly by the city tend greatly to simplify and strengthen the government of the city. But if they are allowed to drift into separate hands then the city government becomes divided and confused. There are divided interests, divided and conflicting authorities. The natural result is corruption, inefficiency, bribery and all manner of evil.

These industrial monopolies have grown up in recent years and they threaten the very life of the democratic

State. In dealing with them the democratic State is left without choice. It must take charge of them upon the principles of coöperation for the advantage of the entire community, or the owners of these monopolies will be forced into a conspiracy against the people.[2]

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER V

Industrial Monopolies

[1] **The Relation of the Modern Municipality to the Gas Supply.**—One of the most interesting phenomena connected with our modern political developments in general, is the slowly but everchanging attitude of the government toward the industry of society. When Adam Smith published his immortal work on the "Wealth of Nations," a little more than a hundred years ago, the industry of the world was bound by a set of governmental restrictions which were slowly but surely crushing out the life which they were intended to nourish and regulate. Laws and regulations which, in their inception had, perhaps, been fully justifiable, had so far outlived their usefulness, that they were doing enormous harm and injury by their continuance. It was the great and unperishable service of Smith that he sounded the war cry of death to these old obstructions which formed an impassable barrier to future industrial progress, and secured to the immediately following, and to all future generations the great advantage of an enormously increased production.

But, like all great revolutions, this movement also rushed into an untenable extreme.

The argument of Smith for a greater freedom from the governmental restrictions of his time — unanswerable as against certain abuses which he had in mind — was used by his successors to prove that government could best protect the interests of society by a policy of do-nothingism. This purely negative theory of government functions became at one time so prevalent, that it led our modern governments to adopt what relatively speaking may be called a system of *laissez faire* — of letting everything take care of itself, which has resulted disastrously in a thousand ways. Under the immense impetus of new

discoveries in industrial processes and of relative freedom of action, so far as the restraining influence of government is concerned, private enterprise went forth into every field. Not content with developing new wealth by which it should be enriched, it sought out and set in order many ways of establishing artificial monopolies by which it might absorb a large portion of existing wealth. So successfully has this system been followed, that the great problem before the modern world is again the same which presented itself to the mind and time of Adam Smith, viz.: How shall we set our industry free from the bonds which bind and cramp it — only in our time the bonds are those which have been made and applied, and are all the while being drawn more tightly by private enterprise and ingenuity, while in Smith's time they were the bonds of government interference and restriction. Smith called upon private enterprise to check and circumscribe government activity; we are forced to call upon government to circumscribe and regulate private enterprise.

Our railroads, our telegraphs, our express companies, our telephone companies, our oil companies, our coal companies, our gas and water companies, all taking their start under the domain of free competition, and growing into strength and vigor under its influence have come to rely for their prosperity and increased earnings not only on the actual increment of wealth which they contribute to the world's stock, but also on the absorption of a larger part of existing wealth by means of artificial monopolies, a state of things which will continually grow worse unless it be made to grow better. . . . The remedies proposed for this disease have been legion in number and infinitely various in character. The one which is most popular with a certain class of extreme optimists and also with their near connections, the extreme pessimists, is that of letting everything alone."—*Prof. E. J. James, in "Publications of the American Economic Association," Vol. I.*

[2] **Control of Productive Industry.**—The direct control and operation of productive industry by the government — in other words, a system of socialism — would doubtless modify the form which our conflicts would take; but it is by no means easy to

prove that these conflicts would be wholly avoided thereby. Indeed with democracies managed as they are at present, where one district is pitted against another, each seeking its own sectional interests; or where president stands on one side and congressman on another, each ready to face the dangers of a deadlock for the sake of the policy which he and those behind him represent; danger of disregard of public needs in the pursuit of private interests would be increased rather than diminished. The more intelligent among the socialists recognize the danger of this sort of deadlock and conflict as government is managed at present; and they say that one of the benefits which they seek in giving additional powers to government is that it will compel people, in mere self defense, to be more accurate in watching the details of its management. But the difficulty of exercising effective oversight under such conditions is very great indeed; and the chance for an outside observer to secure protection to public interests is even smaller than at present, for under present conditions the State comes in as an independent authority and checks the property owners if they go too far, but under a socialistic system, if once a ring came into power it would control politics and industry alike, and there would be no outside means of checking it except through the agency of revolution.—"*Freedom and Responsibility*," by *Arthur Twining Hadley*, pp. 144-145.

CHAPTER VI

CONFLICT BETWEEN DESPOTISM AND COÖPERATION

MODERN invention applied to industry is creating both a new industrial world and a new political world. There has always been the closest relation between the organization of the State and the organization of industry. The primitive village State was an organization based upon the common ownership of land and upon coöperative farming. The feudal State was based upon coöperative farming and coöperative fighting. The democratic State has grown up through coöperative resistance to tyranny. But this is a mere negation. No enduring State can be founded upon a negation. So long as the people are held together only by acts of resistance to tyrants they will be governed by tyrants. The positive element in the building of the democratic State has been coöperative education. The invention of printing was a mighty coöperative agency whereby the learning, the experience of the past became more and more the property of all. The book and the newspaper became instruments for coöperative learning. Through these instruments the Church became a coöperative teaching agency a thousand fold more effective than before. The post-office became a public necessity; likewise the school and the library for the

training of all the people. It is especially through post-office and school that the democratic State has taken positive organic form. The organic democracy may be indefinitely strengthened by the assumption of a few well-defined industrial monopolies mentioned above. For the democratic State to assume control of the city monopolies and of the railways is not necessarily a step in the direction of socialism.[1] There is no more reason in calling this a step towards socialism than in calling it a step to prevent socialism. If the State were to take complete control of the industrial monopolies already formed, then there would be entire freedom to adopt or reject the rest of the socialistic program. The chief industries would still be outside of State control. As to the monopolies already established the State is not free. A monopoly involves State action. If the democratic State neglects or refuses to control the industrial monopolies, then the owners of the monopolies must control the State. To enable them to do this they naturally draw to themselves other industries and organize them as monopolies.[2] This tends directly to create a socialistic State organized as a despotism. Hence the failure of the democratic State to grapple effectively with monopoly is a step towards a despotic form of socialism. If the city cannot control the city monopolies and franchises on democratic principles then it must be governed despotically. After the fact has been thoroughly demonstrated that the democratic State can successfully manage existing industrial

monopolies, then the people may decide for themselves whether they wish to still further extend the activities of the State and add State mining, State farming, State factories and State distribution of goods. It may easily happen that from this vantage ground of freedom with comparative experience, individual initiative and purely voluntary association may be preferred. There might even ensue a tendency for some of the operations already taken over by the State to revert back into private hands. If, on the other hand, State coöperation were preferred, the form of socialism which would ensue would be democratic, it would be the free and voluntary expression of the wishes of the people. In any event the tendency would be to break down and obscure the distinction between voluntary association and State action.

(2) With the advent of steam and electricity the States have become organic as never before. The people are driven to closer interdependence. Every part of the world is coming into vital relation to every other part. It is still an unsettled question whether the world empire is to be dominated by brute force and despotic power, or whether it is to be organized upon the basis of friendly coöperation and mutual helpfulness. Steam and electricity belong naturally to the economy of force. They may as readily be appropriated to strengthen despotism as to strengthen democracy. The only reliable support for democracy is in moral teaching and a passion for righteousness.[3]

SUPPLEMENTARY READING

CHAPTER VI

Conflict Between Despotism and Coöperation

[1] **Socialism.**—The word socialism is used with a variety of meanings. In a recent editorial the *New York Independent*, referring to the rapid multiplication of trusts and monopolies, said that this is not an unmixed evil, since by organization there are immense savings. But the editor remarked, "Of course this means socialism." The democratic State, by giving free play to the building up of monopolies around the railways, directly dependent upon the railway and, in the end, controlled by them, is forming a socialistic State in which the people are not represented. Such a socialistic State would be despotic or oligarchic in form. It would be composed of the few who controlled the means of subsistence in conspiracy against the many who lived by the permission of the few. If, then, a democracy wishes to escape the formation of a socialistic State organized as a despotism, it must administer every monopoly, every franchise, in the interest of all the people. This is the only way whereby the democracy may keep itself free to adopt or reject a complete socialistic organization of the State.

All who are in favor of socialism define the term as a complete elimination of competition from the industrial world by the substitution of democratic coöperation. The enemies of socialism may be sharply divided into two classes. One class is wholly ignorant of the meaning of the term. They call it anarchy, communism, an equal distribution of property, or anything that is bad or unreasonable. The other class look upon socialism as a means of enslaving the masses of the people. In their view, a socialistic State would be a despotic State. It is impossible for such men as Herbert Spencer and Sir Henry

Maine, who believe that government is in its very nature repressive and founded on force, to favor the socialistic State. In their view, the only hope for retaining any tolerable degree of freedom on the part of the people is to retain the largest possible field of industry for free competition and voluntary association. All who believe that government is by nature despotic must oppose socialism. There is still a third class who are of the opinion that, if the democratic State would do well the work of education and sanitation, if it would take effective possession of the few natural industrial monopolies, it would not be found necessary or desirable to organize the whole people into one industrial coöperative society.

[2] **Private Warfare.**—Much that we call money-making is not the addition of wealth. It is money-transferring, not money-gaining. It is the process of making slaves of others, by turning into the pocket of the one that which is rightfully earned by the brains or the hands of others. Some day this manner of "making money," whether practiced by the "predatory rich," or the equally "predatory poor," will become impossible. It will pass under the ban as blackmail and highway robbery have passed. When it is condemned by public opinion the law will condemn it, too; for our statutes are only attempts at the formal expression of such opinion. Industrial warfare is not competition. It is the struggle of devices to stifle competition. Competition is rivalry, to be sure, but rivalry under conditions of fair play. Its function is to secure the best service — to put the right man in the right place. That one man should devour another is not competition. It is war. The abolition of private warfare within a nation has been one of the most important steps in human civilization. The abolition of private war in industrial relations will be another step scarcely lower in importance. But this must come with the growth of human wisdom, by which destructive and dishonest practices may be condemned. It cannot be brought about by the application of force. It cannot follow any form of arbitrary legislation. All statutes must be of equal application; for in taking away from the barons, of whatever kind — feudal or industrial, — the right of private war the

people are bound to guarantee that private war shall not be waged against them. *"The Care and Culture of Men," by David Starr Jordan, pp. 241-242.*

Civilizing Influences. We hear much about the cost of maintaining armies in these territories. Doubtless armies will be wanted, if our business there is mainly plunder. But if our first question as a nation is, how much we can give these people, how much good we can do them, the military and naval estimates can be divided by ten.

Perhaps no nation has ever tried this policy of giving all it could to a people brought under its power. Suppose we try it! A thousand school masters—industrial teachers—would do a hundred times more to keep the peace in the Philippines than a hundred thousand soldiers, and they would cost a hundred times less. Suppose we try what can be done in such populations by weapons that are not carnal. A peaceful invasion of arts and industries would greatly lessen the cost of armaments, and this is the way to get speedy and splendid returns. If we wish to extend our markets then we must civilize these people and thus multiply their wants.

This is what we *can* do. Let every man and woman of us assume that this is what we *will* do. Let us demand in the solution of this problem the most enlightened, the most Christian policy. Let us call upon the President and our Congress to form such methods as shall permit us to give to these peoples promptly and freely the best things we have to give. Let us insist that none but men of conscience and good will be intrusted with the great responsibilities of leadership among them.

To our President, especially on whom the great business mainly rests, let us lift up our voice. This job, Mr. President, is not for spoilsmen. The kind of men who are now clamoring to have the civil service rules relaxed are not the men for work like this. It would be better to recommend an appropriation for an almshouse in Washington in which to feed them. It would be better still to pen them into a reservation somewhere and let Indian agents minister unto them.

They are not the kind of men to send to these islands. We

want honest men, broad-minded men, kind-hearted men — men who can comprehend that a nation may have a philanthropic purpose. Such men can be found, and with such men this nation can do a kind of work not often done as yet on the face of the earth. Something of the sort she has done of late with the weapons of war. She can do it better yet, in the days before us with the arts of peace. The people have the true purpose; let them not be misrepresented. Give us the right leaders and we will prove to the cynics at home and the carpers abroad that this nation is not only great to plant and build, to forge and fight, but that she is greatest when she bends to the work of succoring the poor and leading the benighted into light and liberty.— *Washington Gladden, "Independent," Jan. 12, 1899, p. 106.*

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW. PART VIII

1. How are kindergarten teachers chosen? Why should required education extend to the age of sixteen? What is the chief agency for the education of the whole adult population? Besides school and library, what agencies may the State employ in the work of education?

2. What are the various stages in the development of the medical profession? Can contagious disease be stayed without State action? How does public sanitation tend to promote civic righteousness?

3. Must the just State care for the rights of the unborn citizen? Why do nervous diseases increase? How may nervous diseases be lessened?

4. Must a voluntary organization control its individuals? Would a system of schools and libraries reaching all the people become a part of the State? Must the individual submit to organized society in order to extend his individual importance? How does the will of a society differ from the wills of the individuals composing it? Is membership in the State a matter of choice?

5. In what respect does the democratic State surpass all other voluntary organizations? Is the postal system a necessary part of the democratic State? Do the tele-

graph and railway belong to State coöperation? If the State does not control the railway, must the railway control the State? What city monopolies are in their nature public?

6. If the State assume control of the present industrial monopolies does it of necessity follow that it assume other industries? Is the democratic State free to leave the railways and city monopolies outside of its control? Do industrial monopolies left to themselves tend to monopolize all industries? May steam and electricity strengthen despotism as readily as democracy? What is the chief dependence for the support of democracy?

SUBJECTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY

1. The growth of State education in the last half century.

2. Sanitation during the last century.

3. Heredity and nervous diseases.

4. The will of the people in the making of the United States, Switzerland and England.

5. The growth of monopoly.

6. Wealth against Commonwealth. Lloyd.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

Form 410